





# MAYNOOTH,

THE

## CROWN, AND THE COUNTRY;

OR, A

## PROTEST,

ON BEHALF OF THE MONARCHY AND THE NATION,

AGAINST THE NEW, AUGMENTED, PERMANENT, AND

UNCONTROLLED ENDOWMENT

OF THE

Roman Catholic College of Maynooth;

THE CONSTITUTION AND INFLUENCE OF WHICH IS SHOWN,

BY EVIDENCE DERIVED FROM ITSELF,

TO BE INCOMPATIBLE WITH ALLEGIANCE TO THE CROWN;

AND FRAUGHT WITH DANGER

TO THE COUNTRY, BOTH FROM WITHIN AND FROM WITHOUT.

---

New Edition,

WITH AN

APPENDIX OF DOCUMENTS, AND A POSTSCRIPT.

---

LONDON:

FRANCIS & JOHN RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, & WATERLOO PLACE.

---

1845.



# MAYNOOTH,

&c.

## ERRATA.

Page 50, note 1, *for 43, read 45.*

59, line 17, *after Maynooth, add (now Titular Bishop,)*

66, note 4, *for Note V. read Note U.*

74, *omit the word on at the end of the third line from the bottom.*

78, in note, *for Note U. read Note V.*

83, line 7 from bottom, *after rebellion, add (which cost the country sixteen millions of money, to say nothing of the effusion of blood. See Madden's United Irishmen, i. 377,)*

91, line 16, *after 1829, add, as a note, See above, p. 69, note.*

— 17, *for exigences read exigencies*

102, line 4, *after 1839. omit the words are as follows,*

110, line 8, *after the Rev. T. W. Dixon, add late Student of Maynooth,*

who have a right to seek for steady guidance and quietness at their hands, and, if not directed and maintained in the way of unity and peace, will be led to exert the power which they possess to the injury of the Civil Authority and to the disorganization of the State.

And, at such a period of a nation's history, the evils to be feared from this very hazardous position of affairs become more formidable and imminent from the circumstance that men are usually disposed to



## M A Y N O O T H,

&c.

---

UNITY in true religion being the great conservative principle of a Commonwealth, and civil discord and disquiet being the natural consequences of religious dissension, it is certain that when a nation is passing from the *Toleration* of various forms of religious belief to the *Encouragement* of them, its Civil Rulers have great cause for alarm, whether they look upward to heaven unto Him Who is the lover of peace and truth, and from Whom all national blessings and judgments come, or downward to earth on those who have a right to seek for steady guidance and quietness at their hands, and, if not directed and maintained in the way of unity and peace, will be led to exert the power which they possess to the injury of the Civil Authority and to the disorganization of the State.

And, at such a period of a nation's history, the evils to be feared from this very hazardous position of affairs become more formidable and imminent from the circumstance that men are usually disposed to



shrink from the labour of investigating, and from the difficulty of maintaining, *general principles*, however important they may be; and are prone to be content to acquiesce in the admission of evils however manifest, provided they but seem to bear some analogy to ills which already exist, and to follow as consequences from them; and they are thus, almost insensibly, brought to the condition of regarding *present national evils* as sufficient *reasons* for *new evils*, and to look on *disorders* in the body politic as necessitating *fresh diseases*, rather than as demanding *remedies*: and not only so, but they are not unwilling to imagine analogies where none exist, and tacitly to consent to the introduction of new disorders of a *different* kind, on the plea of some resemblance which they are *alleged* to bear to those already in existence.

But we feel ourselves compelled to question, whether he who loves his country and searches after truth will, or can, or ought to be so deceived; whether he will not look upon evils, public or private, as requiring *relief* rather than *aggravation*; whether he will not consider them as appealing powerfully and practically to him and to all whose duty it is to listen to their voice, for the reviewal, and, if it be possible, for the retracing of those steps which have led to such bad results. Yes, and will he not take care, as far as he is able, that if *he* is suffering from the errors of his *ancestors*, his *posterity* may not in their turn be the victims of his weakness, vice, or imprudence? And then, after all, should not the



result of his endeavours for the prevention of evil and recovery of good be equal to his desires, yet he will find ample consolation in the consciousness that in his generation he has served, in some degree, to keep alive a traditional assertion of truth, to be, as it were, one link in a chain of protestation against falsehood, and has helped to animate those who may come *after* him, to contend in the same cause: and he will rejoice also in the persuasion, that all the time and thought which he may have expended in labours for the honour of lawfully constituted civil authority, and of Him from Whom all authority is derived, will be rewarded with abundant recompense into his bosom when nations and empires shall have passed away.

But it is likewise true that such a person will not neglect the use of human prudence and discrimination in scrutinizing new evils, as they may arise, and which some will plead are sanctioned and rendered necessary by the existence of old ones: he will not admit analogies of this kind with facility, but will judge of each case by its own merits. And, to advert now to that immediately before him at the present time,—one of a very grave and momentous kind,—he will be very far from conceding that, because the British Nation *has*, in some instances, sanctioned the policy of making grants of public money to various forms of Christianity, it must therefore, either on the plea of consistency or any other, acquiesce in an *augmentation* of the annual grant to the *Roman Catholic College of Maynooth*.

This question, we assert, is to be examined simply and absolutely on *its own merits* ; and then, when it is so examined, it will, we believe, be found to bear little or *no analogy* <sup>1</sup> to those with which it is sometimes associated, as we shall endeavour to demonstrate in the following pages.

But we may go much further and do affirm, and trust we shall be able to prove, that this augmentation of the public grant to Maynooth,—*such* as Maynooth *is*, and such as it has been *shown* to be on unquestionable evidence,—would be *inconsistent* and *irreconcilable with*, and *directly contrary to*, the duty of the State to itself.

This is what we propose to show, and we shall do so without any reference to matters which are not purely *civil*, and which therefore are not only *fit* subjects for the cognizance of the State, but such as it is *bound* to consider, on the common principles of self-preservation.

Meanwhile be it observed that we enter on this discussion, and we shall hope to carry it on, with no other desire than this,—that as the Roman Catholic Clergy of Ireland are our fellow-Christians, and our fellow-subjects, so we may be all united as such in the same undivided allegiance to the same God in heaven, and to the same monarch upon earth ; and let us be permitted to repeat of our *civil*, what a great man <sup>2</sup> said with respect to our *religious* differences, “touching those main parts of Christian truth, wherein they constantly still persist, we gladly ac-

<sup>1</sup> Appendix, Note A.

<sup>2</sup> Hooker, iii. 1. 10.

knowledge them to be of the family of Jesus Christ; and our hearty prayer to Almighty God is, that being conjoined so far forth with them, they may at the length (if it be His will) so yield to frame and reform themselves, that no distraction remain in any thing, but that we all may, with one heart and one mouth, glorify the Father of our Lord and Saviour, Whose Church we are."

This then being understood, we will first observe in approaching this subject that we are met by certain allegations, which to some appear to have considerable weight.

When we question the wisdom and safety of increasing the grant to the College of Maynooth, we are asked, "Do you recollect the *origin* of that institution? do you remember under what *auspices* it *arose*? do you not forget that it was established by the Parliament of the Irish nation, with the approval, if not with the advice, of Mr. Pitt, and with the sanction of King George III.? And do you then pretend to present yourself before us as if you understood better the interests of the Crown and of the Country, than that Monarch and his distinguished adviser? Are not those, who wish well to the British Empire, heard often to express their desire that it may always have such Sovereigns and Statesmen as those to whom Maynooth owes its existence?"

All this we know well, and we hear and receive it with no dissatisfaction at all. And "what then," it may be asked, "do you allege in reply?"

First of all,—we would say a few words with



regard to that fallibility from which the greatest men are not exempt, and from which only the weakest and worst claim to be free; and that therefore no *opinions* or *examples* of *men*, however excellent, are to have with us the force of *laws*; and we would say next, that though *some* wise and excellent men did approve of the foundation of Maynooth,—for reasons to which we shall presently refer,—and for these reasons, let me add, Mr. Burke<sup>1</sup> mentions such a design *without disapproval*—yet it must not be forgotten, that many *other* great men were of a contrary opinion, *before* the results of Maynooth were matters of history; and that among those who took an active part by petition and remonstrance against the proposed measure, was one whose name is never to be mentioned without veneration, for his intellectual vigour, solid erudition, and masculine courage,—I mean the late Archbishop Magee<sup>2</sup>, who has left on record a statement of his own fears on that subject, before the College was founded, which, alas! like some of his other predictions on another topic of a similar but still more momentous nature, where confident expectations were entertained of the most

<sup>1</sup> Grattan's Life of Grattan, iv. 155. Unless some such college were founded, Mr. Burke says, that his son, Mr. R. Burke, was of opinion "that barbarism and Jacobinism will almost certainly enter by the breach made by the atheistic faction in France, in the destruction of the Irish seminaries in that kingdom."

<sup>2</sup> Digest of Evidence before Parliament concerning Ireland, 1824, 1825, by Rev. W. Phelan, B.D., and Rev. M. O'Sullivan, 2 vols. 1826; i. 117, 118.

favourable issues, have been signally and lamentably verified<sup>1</sup>.

If authorities of this description be further required, it is not irrelevant to advert to the circumstance stated by the late President of Maynooth, Dr. Crotty<sup>2</sup>, that “when Mr. *Perceval* was applied to, in 1809, instead of granting the sum (12,000*l.*) that had been granted to Maynooth the year before, he *lowered* it to what it had been (7000*l.*).”

But we will now maintain that we are not in any way concerned to express an opinion either on one side or the other, with regard to the expediency of the *original foundation* of Maynooth in the year 1795.

We know that the circumstances of that period were full of difficulty and danger. All the Seminaries in France, where the Irish Roman Catholic Ecclesiastics had hitherto been usually educated, were destroyed<sup>3</sup>; and, even if they had not been so, yet such was the condition of the times, that all loyal and religious principles would have been rooted out of them. Take one specimen of the public opinion prevalent in France at that period with regard to Education. In 1792 Condorcet had come forward with his Report on that subject, before the Legislative Assembly, and, in the words of the historian of Education in France<sup>4</sup>, “il part de deux

<sup>1</sup> Appendix, Note B.

<sup>2</sup> Maynooth Report, p. 53. See *ibid.* p. 406. By the Act of Union, 39 & 40 Geo. III. cap. 67, art. 8, the average grant for six years previous, to Charitable Institutions, &c., was to be continued to 1821 in such a way as Parliament should direct.

<sup>3</sup> See note, p. 8.

<sup>4</sup> M. de Riancey, tome i. p. 15.

principes audacieusement formulés ; *la négation de toute religion et la perfectibilité indéfinie de l'espèce humaine.*" So much then for the *moral* and *religious* part of the subject : now for the civil. In 1793 David presented his Report, on the same topic, to the French Convention, proposing "l'érection sur le Pont-Neuf d'un monument qui représenterait l'image du *Peuple Géant* ; les effigies des *Rois* et les débris de leurs vils attributs lui serviraient de piédestal<sup>1</sup> ;" and, as a close to the whole, the National Assembly, shortly after, decreed<sup>2</sup>, as a necessary qualification for the office of Instructor, in every School, that he should take the Oath "*de haine à la Royauté et d'attachement à la République.*"

It is evident, then, that, at the period of the foundation of Maynooth, Continental Education had become almost unattainable to the future Roman Catholic Ecclesiastics of Ireland, or, if attainable, was only to be had adulterated with atheistical and anarchical principles ; and, it must not be forgotten, in addition to this, that it was very reasonable to hope—alas ! that this hope (as we shall show) has been so unhappily frustrated,—that *if* education, free from all foreign influences, civil and ecclesiastical, were provided by the *State* for that class of Irish subjects which had hitherto been trained abroad, they would grow up in feelings of patriotism and loyalty, and would be examples, in their own practice, of that submission and obedience to civil authority, which Ministers of the Gospel are specially required,

<sup>1</sup> M. de Riancey, tome i. p. 31.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 65.



by the Word of God, to teach<sup>1</sup>, and for the due maintenance of which they are there enjoined to pray<sup>2</sup>.

We repeat, then, that we are by no means concerned to express *any* opinion,—favourable or the reverse,—on the expediency or necessity of the *foundation* of Maynooth in 1795. Nor, if we grant, for argument's sake, that the measure *was then a wise one*, are we, by any means, obliged to allow, that its maintenance is just or prudent at the *present time*. No; on the contrary, if the Institution is shown,—yes, if it even *show itself*,—to have been productive of great injuries to the Monarchy of these realms,—if the annual bounty of the Nation is proved to have been *abused* to purposes injurious to the public peace and welfare,—if these abuses are not in course of rectification, but the reverse, and are difficult to rectify,—then we affirm, let the Institution of Maynooth have been a public *benefit* in 1795, yet it has become, in 1845, a public *calamity*, and ought, we do not hesitate to say, to be treated accordingly. This is no strange doctrine in human affairs. The brazen serpent was erected by Moses at the command of God, but, at a subsequent period, the same unchangeable God did not disapprove of its *destruction* by Hezekiah<sup>3</sup>.

The sole question, then, to be considered is this:—*how* has the public money, voted to the maintenance of Maynooth, been spent? to what purposes has it

<sup>1</sup> Tit. iii. 1.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Tim. ii. 1, 2.

<sup>3</sup> Numbers xxi. 9. 2 Kings xviii. 4.

been applied? what benefits has the country derived, or is likely to derive, from this expenditure? Is there reason to believe, — (this, we say, is the question which the Nation has not only a *right*, but a *duty* to ask,)—that the influence exercised by Maynooth, has been, is, or will be, salutary to the Monarchy, and conducive to the maintenance of its integrity, and to the peace and welfare of the country? Yes; and more than this, is there not great ground for apprehending that its tendency will be to weaken the power, and undermine the stability, of the United Kingdom, and to expose it to danger from *foreign foes*, and not only to enfeeble it by distractions from within, but to render it, also, more vulnerable from *without*?

Still more than all this,—Is, we ask, the evidence of the case of such a kind,—are the *influences* to which Maynooth is subject,—are merely the *political principles* (for of the *religious*, as I have said, I do not now speak) which are inculcated by it of such a character,—are the opinions entertained and expressed of its *results* by persons of the most various conditions of life and political sentiments of so favourable a tone,—as that now, fifty years after its foundation, the English Nation should not only continue the grant which she has hitherto awarded to it, but should come forward and give a fresh mark of her *confidence* in its attachment to the Crown and to the Constitution, and select it as a fit object for special *honour* and *reward* at her hands, and propose

it publicly to the eyes of the empire and the world as an *example* to be *imitated* by institutions of national education, and should afford *additional means* for the *promotion* of the *principles* which it teaches, and for the *aggrandizement* of the *power* to which it is subject, by an *augmentation* of the grant of public money in its behalf?

We have spoken of anticipations entertained concerning it previously to its foundation, and at the period when it arose; and we have also referred to judgments subsequent to its establishment; and we affirm that these latter are infinitely more weighty than the former, just so far as the experience of the past is more sure than surmises concerning the future. We might quote an abundant variety of testimony to the injury inflicted by this institution on the Monarchy to which it owes its origin, and on the Country from which it derives its support; but we content ourselves with barely referring to this testimony given at large in our Appendix<sup>1</sup>, and by citing two witnesses alone, who cannot be suspected of unfavourable dispositions toward it. Mr. O'Connell<sup>2</sup>, in his evidence before the House of Commons, in 1825, compared the political character of the priests who were trained in *France* before the foundation of *Maynooth* with that of those who had been educated *at this institution*. "The priests," he said, "who were educated in *France* had a natural abhorrence of the French revolution; *but*, with the

<sup>1</sup> Appendix, Note D.

<sup>2</sup> Note C.



priests educated at *Maynooth*, the Anti-jacobin feeling is gone by; and therefore, in the phrase *that is usually called loyalty*," (such are his words,) "they do not come so much within the description of it as the priests educated in France." And Mr. Wyse<sup>3</sup>, accounting for the change which has taken place among the Roman Catholic clergy, and for their diminished attachment to the Crown, says very emphatically, "*Maynooth began to be felt.*"

To sum up, then, what we have to say upon this head. We owe it to the experiment of King George the Third and of his Minister, Mr. Pitt, that we are now, or ought to be, wiser in this matter than they were then; and we hold that there is great reason to believe that if they now saw and knew what we see and know of the abuses to which their act has been perverted, they would be the first to condemn us if we should confirm, extend, and perpetuate those abuses by making them the objects of honour, reward, and imitation.

In truth, their act holds out to us a most solemn warning, to hesitate and pause before we expect good results from Romanism, *as long as it remains what it is*; and still more, therefore, before we encourage it even upon the strongest grounds of temporary expediency, if they can be shown to exist. *Maynooth*, let us remember, was founded by the Crown, in order to rescue the Romanist clergy from democratical

<sup>3</sup> Note D.

principles, and to render them more loyal<sup>1</sup>. Its effect has been to make them much less loyal than they were before, and to prepare them to become leaders in a democracy, and to be made the instruments of a foreign power.

Another argument,—one also addressed *ad verecundiam*,—will probably be alleged against us, when we question the expediency of the increase of the grant. Is not (it may be said) this a matter to be left entirely in the hands of the advisers of the Crown? Are not they the best judges of its claims, and the most faithful guardians of its interests? Is it consistent with the deference due to them and their office to interpose in a question to which they will give the most deliberate and careful attention, as its vast importance requires? To which we reply, that it is even a part of the respect which we owe to them, and an evidence of our desire for the honour and welfare of the Sovereign, for which we must believe them to be more zealous than for their own, to submit to them respectfully but frankly, modestly and humbly, but yet fearlessly and confidently, what, after due examination and reflection, seems to us not fit to be concealed either from them or from the world, in a matter of great public interest; and then,

<sup>1</sup> To other unexceptionable testimonies to this effect may be added that of Mr. Grattan. (Life of Grattan, iv. 234.) “As the Catholic Clergy were liable to be affected in their education abroad by Anti-English sentiments, it was thought advisable to adopt this mode of preventing it.”

having so done, we feel satisfied that if we have erred, we shall have pardon at their hands; and if we have spoken the truth, we shall receive thanks, and shall obtain from them that attention which truth always deserves.

But to pass on to two other arguments of a different nature, which are alleged in favour of the proposed augmentation.

However we might wish it otherwise, it is, notwithstanding (we are told), an uncontrovertible fact, that a very large majority of the inhabitants of Ireland are Roman Catholics; and this being the case, it is alleged to be the bounden duty of the State to provide education suitable for their clergy, and to *increase* the grant for that purpose *pari passu* with the increase of the population. Their numbers claim this at the hands of the nation; and if the country does not grant it, we know not, it is said, what may be the results; general discontent, disloyalty, civil commotion, bloodshed, these may be the fruits of our obstinacy.

Whatever, therefore, our *desires* may be, thus the argument proceeds, we have no *choice*, we are *compelled* by the *necessities of the case*. And, such being the reasonableness of the claim, and such the emergency, we are further told, that we *need* not *apprehend* that the concession will be attended with danger, to whatever extent it may be made. No, we are asked, why is *England* to *refuse* what is *granted* by so many other nations of Europe? You speak to us



of the peril threatening the State, *as a State*, from the encouragement of Popery, as if Roman Catholic Priests and Bishops could not be loyal subjects; as if there was something peculiar in their character and duties which incapacitated them from discharging the functions of good and faithful citizens; an allegation which we boldly repudiate in their name, and in support of our protest against it, we bid you cast your eyes across the channel on France, and Spain, and Austria, and even on Russia with her Greek Church, and on Lutheran and Calvinistic Prussia, all of whom, as you cannot be ignorant, give public endowments to the support of ecclesiastical establishments of persons of the Romish religion.

To this we answer, that we do not question the fact above stated concerning the population<sup>1</sup> of Ireland. Nor do we pretend to deny that there might be some danger in withdrawing the grant from Maynooth, if that were the question at issue; and we will readily allow that the Roman Catholic Clergy and some of the Laity would welcome an augmentation of it with satisfaction; nay, let us even concede, for a moment, that the rejection by Parliament of the proposal for the increase would be attended with peril, and would excite general discontent, and civil commotion in that part of the community. Let all these be *facts*; and, if they be so, important ones they are. Still, there are, in our

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Leslie Foster states that the Protestant population is to the Roman Catholic as one to a little more than two and a half. Digest, i. 32.

judgment, *other facts* much more certain, and infinitely more important, than these, and indeed paramount to all other considerations.

It is a *fact* (whatever may be alleged to the contrary), that Queen Victoria<sup>1</sup> is the Sovereign of Ireland, and that the inhabitants of that country are her subjects by indefeasible right, which it is the bounden duty of every citizen of the empire to maintain; it is a *fact* also, that the constitution and administration of the College of Maynooth, as it exists at present, and as we shall shortly prove it to exist from Maynooth itself, is directly opposed to the maintenance and exercise of the prerogatives of the Crown; and lastly, whatever may be said of the *prospects* of a civil war to break out *hereafter*, it is certain, by its own showing, that Maynooth is already, and has been for some time, *waging a civil war* of the most dangerous kind with the Monarchy, and is supplying arms in every part of Ireland against it.

Now, if it be the duty of a government to reclaim the erring, to restrain the disorderly, and to punish the rebellious, and if the discharge of this duty becomes more important in proportion as the number is *greater* of those who are likely to fall victims to the delusions of the designing and factious, and if it be the prime duty and noblest function of a government to support the *loyal few*; and the *fewer* they are, the more *need* they have of its support, and the stronger is its obligation (*as it values its own existence*) to support them; then we say, that were the num-

<sup>1</sup> Appendix, Note P.

bers of the Roman Catholic population of Ireland ten times greater than at present, still they would afford no argument to justify the augmentation of the grant of the public money to the education of the Romanist Clergy, if that education is to bear those fruits which, after *fifty years'* trial, and an expenditure of about *half a million* upon it, have been produced by the College of Maynooth. On the contrary, the more numerous those in question were, the more formidable would they be under such influence, and the more urgent would be the duty of the State to diminish its power rather than to promote its aggrandizement.

We do not deny that the governments of France, Austria, and Spain, and those likewise of Russia and of Prussia, afford support to Ecclesiastical institutions of the Roman Catholic Religion. Indeed we might observe, it has not yet been shown what *benefits* they *derive*, in their civil character, from the encouragement of Romanism as such. We have heard, for instance, something recently of collisions at Cologne between the Temporal and Spiritual power, and we have seen in the last year that the same Ecclesiastic, who resisted his Sovereign on the banks of the Rhine, was soon after received by the Pope with marked honour and public collaudation on those of the Tiber.

But we do not pause to inquire further into cases of this description, but proceed to ask, why, if Russia and Prussia, two of the States enumerated, are satisfied that the system of Ecclesiastical polity which



we have established, and are still maintaining in unrestrained liberty and in uncontrolled energy at Maynooth, is inoffensive and innoxious to the public weal, have they taken such pains to *exclude* it? But are not then Roman Catholic Priests and Bishops educated and maintained in Russia and Prussia at the public charge? Doubtless they are; but let us observe under what restrictions they enter upon and exercise their functions. They are bound hand and foot by civil laws; they cannot undertake their office without the approval of the government, and are generally nominated by the Crown; and when appointed to their Ecclesiastical functions they cannot hold *any commerce* with *Rome except* through the *medium of the Civil Government*. These things are all in evidence before Parliament, and it is since the foundation of Maynooth that they have been made public; and whatever may have been the case with our predecessors, we at least cannot be excused if we are ignorant of them<sup>1</sup>.

But, it may be urged, this is the practice of the Russian and Prussian Governments, both of which are *hostile* to Rome, on account of their religious principles: let us inquire into the usages of those countries who *love her more*, and *know her better*; let us examine what is done in the rest of the specified cases, in *Roman Catholic Countries*, in Spain, in Austria, and France. Here, again, we need only appeal to authentic evidence before Parliament.

<sup>1</sup> Appendix, Note E.

All this has been elaborately detailed in the Report of the Select Committee on the Laws and Ordinances existing in Foreign States, respecting the regulation of their Roman Catholic subjects in Ecclesiastical matters, and their intercourse with the See of Rome, printed by order of Parliament in the years 1814, 1816, and 1817. From this we gather what is the policy, with respect to Rome, of those States who are best acquainted with her and most attached to her<sup>1</sup>.

To state briefly their practice, of which a fuller account is here offered in the Appendix<sup>2</sup>; in none of these countries are Bishops appointed to their places by the Pope, but in all by the Crown: the Oath of the Bishops to the Pope is to be taken in no other sense than that of *canonical obedience*, and not (as in *Ireland*) of *feudal vassalage*; no communication can be held with Rome by the Papal hierarchy without the cognizance of the Civil Power, nor any bull or brief be received and published by them without being previously submitted to the Government, and without the Royal *Placet* and *Exequatur*; so that, on the whole, the late President of Maynooth, Dr. Crotty<sup>3</sup>, might well say, as he did in 1826, "It is a *general practice*, as far as my knowledge goes, in *Catholic* States, to prohibit the publication of any rescript from the Pope, and in some countries, though these rescripts should contain matters appertaining to *faith*, until the *temporal power* shall have

<sup>1</sup> Note E.

<sup>2</sup> Note E.

<sup>3</sup> Maynooth Report, p. 85.

been first satisfied that there is nothing in such rescripts *derogatory to the rights of the Sovereign*. Such is the practice, as I have been informed (he adds), in *France* and *Spain*, and I know it to be the case in *Portugal* by my own experience."

In all respects, then, the measures taken by these Governments against the exercise of the Papal power in their dominions, are distinguished by as much caution and vigour as they are even in Prussia and in Russia.

Next with regard specially to France—and let me be permitted to lay particular stress on this case—none of the numerous changes which have occurred in the Civil Government of that country during the last hundred years, have led to any alterations in *one* respect, namely, in the determination of the Temporal Power to uphold the *four Articles*<sup>1</sup> of the *Gallican Church*; the first of which asserts the plenary independence and supremacy of the Civil Ruler in temporal matters. We shall see hereafter what has been the fate of these Articles at Maynooth; but in *France*, the Bourbon dynasty, the Republic, the Consulate, the Empire, the Restoration (attached as it was to the Papacy), and lastly, the Orleans dynasty, have *all agreed* in *one* point,—the *necessity of requiring subscription* to these four Articles, on the part of all who are admitted to *teach* in the *Ecclesiastical Seminaries* of the country. And, in addition to this, not

<sup>1</sup> Appendix, Note F.



only was it commanded by Louis the XIV<sup>th</sup> <sup>1</sup>, and his successors, that these Articles should be so subscribed and publicly maintained and taught, and the *contrary* opinions (that is, the *Ultramontane* doctrines concerning civil allegiance,) as publicly *rejected* ; but, further, these four Articles were *strengthened* tenfold by the *Concordat* of 1801, and the *Organic Law* of the same year <sup>2</sup>. And yet, be it observed, after all this care and caution,—(whether this result is to be attributed to the non-submission of the Ecclesiastical power to the Civil, or to the encroachment of the Civil on the Ecclesiastical, or rather to the *impossibility* of *reconciling* the *two*, after the admission of the one false principle, (which the *Gallican* Articles did *not* exclude, but which, let Heaven be thanked, is excluded by the Articles of the Churches of *England* and *Ireland*,) namely, of the indispensable *necessity* of communion with the Chair of St. Peter, as the One Centre of Unity, (*whatever Rome may be, and whatever she may do*,) it has now come to pass, that at the *present* time the Bishops and Clergy of France are ashamed of nothing so much as of those very Gallican *Liberties* which they now term *servitudes*, for which Bossuet, their redoubted champion against Protestantism, contended all his life through to his death ; and of which the Bishop of Angers said, in

<sup>1</sup> Edit du 23 Mars, 1682. See also Arrêt du Conseil du 24 Mai, 1766.

<sup>2</sup> Dupin, Manuel du Droit Public Ecclésiastique Français, p. 157—228.

his Pastoral Letter to his Clergy in the middle of the last century, “Ces Vérités seront *toujours* la marque certaine pour distinguer *tout Français fidèle à son Dieu et à son Roi*<sup>1</sup> !”

But let us now turn our eyes to *Ireland*, and to its Roman Catholic hierarchy, whose connexion with, and supreme control over *Maynooth*, will be shown presently. What a contrast is here! So *far* from *receiving* the principles (which are the law of France) of the Concordat and Loi Organique of 1801, they do not admit those of the *Gallican Articles*: they *reject* them; they teach the very opposite of them, those of the Ultramontane School. This is a strong assertion; but it is not made by us without sufficient authority, no other than that of one whom the Bishops of Ireland themselves elected<sup>2</sup> as their organ in the year 1807, the celebrated Dr. Milner, the author of the “End of Religious Controversy;” the Apologist, in a word, of Romanism, who declared publicly in 1808, “that there was *not a single Prelate in Ireland* who was not firmly resolved to *reject* the *four Articles* of the *Gallican Church*, commonly called the Gallican Liberties<sup>3</sup>;” and besides this, not only were they “resolved to reject them,” but, as Dr. O’Conor, himself a Romanist, informs us, in a Synod assembled at a place

<sup>1</sup> Abbé de la Bastide, p. x. of Preface to Abbé Fleury’s *Discours sur les Libertés de l’Eglise Gallicane*, 1765.

<sup>2</sup> Digest, ii. 214.

<sup>3</sup> Appendix, Note G.

called Tullagh, in Ireland, they *did formally reject them*<sup>1</sup>.

Look, then, at the position of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in Ireland, as compared with that which it holds in *every other country of Europe*, save in the Papal States, and, we repeat, what a contrast is here! In all those countries,—be they Romanist, or be they not so,—there is agreement in this, that the Romanist Clergy should be under the control of the Civil Power. They hold their appointments, either directly or indirectly, from the Crown. Not a syllable is to be breathed by them into the ears of Rome, except it first enter those of the Government. And every thing *from* that quarter is examined by it with the minute scrutiny of a customhouse, and is fumigated and ventilated with the cautious apprehensiveness of a lazaretto. Now, why all this labour and pains, unworthy of the confidence which ought to be reposed by a Government in the Ministers of Religion,—except from a *knowledge* of what *Rome is*, and from a *fear* of what she *can* and *will do*, in opposition to, and subversion of, the temporal power, and in acts tending to the disorganization of the Civil fabric, wherever she has the means of exercising her influence?

But look again at *Ireland*. There, and there *alone*, is *free trade carried on with Rome*. Her mandates are received without let or hindrance; there is no preventive service (and *Rome will*<sup>2</sup> *allow of*

<sup>1</sup> Digest, ii. 106.

<sup>2</sup> Foreign Report, p. 513. See further below on this point, p. 77.



*none*) to prohibit their introduction; no quarantine through which they must pass. No canons are enacted by the Roman Catholic Bishops of Ireland without her permission. And how should it be otherwise? They are all nominees of the Pope, and are bound to him, as we shall see, by oaths of feudal allegiance. They are the *Pope's subjects* and not the *Queen's*. In all other countries the Bishops are appointed by the Crown; but in Ireland, as we are told by the late Dr. Doyle<sup>1</sup> (one of the Trustees of Maynooth), “even if temporalities were attached to Roman Catholic Sees, it would be *inconsistent with the doctrine or discipline* of the Church to *admit any interference* on the part of the *Protestant Sovereign* of this country in the appointments of Bishops.”

True, indeed, the Roman Catholic Bishops went so far as to *concede* to the *Crown* the right, not of nomination, but of *Veto* on their appointments, in 1799<sup>2</sup>, but they afterwards repented of that step<sup>3</sup>; and the process now in use<sup>4</sup> is, in the election of a Bishop, for the Clergy to choose three names, which are submitted to the Archbishop and Suffragans of his province, and are by them communicated to the Pope, who names one of the number to the vacant see.

To what, then, is reduced the argument from the practice of other European countries, with respect to

<sup>1</sup> Appendix, Note H.

<sup>2</sup> See Foreign Report, 1814, p. 57.

<sup>3</sup> Appendix, Notes I. and D.

<sup>4</sup> Ireland Education Report, 1835, p. 336.

the innocuousness of that system of ecclesiastical and temporal subordination to a foreign power, which prevails in Ireland, and which is strengthened by Maynooth, to such a degree, that Lord Castlereagh declared, without reserve, that “the Roman Catholic Hierarchy in Ireland is known to be in a state of *more* complete and unqualified dependence on a *foreign* authority, than *any other* Catholic Church now *subsisting in Europe*<sup>1</sup>.”

Yes, we add, they are dependent on an authority *different* from that of their lawful Sovereign; and not only are *they dependent* on a *different* power, but on a *foreign* one; and not on a *foreign* power merely, but on a *hostile* one; and not only on a *hostile* one, but a *spiritual* one, which is as much *superior* in their minds to the *civil*, as heaven is higher than earth, and eternity more durable than time.

We have great doubts whether the history of *any* kingdom or country that exists, or has ever existed in the world, affords any encouragement to a State to negotiate and traffic either on spiritual or secular matters with the See or Court of Rome: but of this we are sure, that *as long as Rome is what she is*, and as long as England and Ireland are what they are, *all the countries* which have been cited in *favour* of allowing her to exercise the power (which she now possesses in Ireland) without restraint, and even with approbation and encouragement on our part, will rise up

<sup>1</sup> Butler's Historical Memoirs, ii. 148.

and *condemn us* for our want of prudence and regard to our own peace and that of our posterity, nay, and more than this, even to the best interests of those Roman Catholics themselves, who are the instruments of the system, and who are our fellow-citizens and fellow-subjects; yes, all those very countries themselves will condemn us for our lack of patriotism and loyalty, if we neglect to profit by their experience, and if we exercise *less caution* in this matter than they do, when, from our peculiar circumstances, our *need* of it must be obviously even *greater* than theirs.

I enter more fully into these details, because, as will soon appear, it is impossible to understand the constitution and working of Maynooth without an accurate knowledge and careful consideration of the position of the Roman Catholic hierarchy of Ireland, and of the relation in which it stands both to the Pope and to the Crown.

And now let us proceed to examine the claims of Maynooth to public approval and patronage, and to increased national support.

We waive, as was before said, all reference to its *religious* teaching. This has occupied the attention of others. We confine ourselves simply to its *political elements* and *influences*, into which we contend the State is bound to inquire, both on all other accounts and even for the sake of Maynooth itself, of its trustees and its professors, and of its numerous students, and especially of that large population (of



which the Crown is the guardian) which will fall under the teaching, guidance, and superintendence of those who are trained at that Institution, and who pass from its walls *without any interval* of time or any other neutralizing influence whatever<sup>1</sup>, to discharge the duties of the priesthood.

Concerning Maynooth, our evidence shall be derived from Maynooth itself, and from those for whom it entertains and expresses the highest respect ; and this being premised, we proceed to consider the objects and constitution of that college.

It is a prevalent notion in England, that, since that seminary is now almost exclusively devoted to the education of the *priesthood*, therefore it is not at liberty to admit students who have no such destination. But this is an error. If its funds should allow, it may hereafter become the *University of Ireland*. Here is one of the most important features of this question. Here, in our opinion, is one of the most formidable elements of its constitution. If Parliament augments its resources, no one can anticipate what the results will be to the British monarchy and nation from that *increase*, and from its consequent extension and aggrandizement in all classes and professions of society. That this is a true

<sup>1</sup> The fact is, they are ordained Sub-Deacons at the end of their first Divinity year, at Maynooth, Deacons at the end of the second, and Priests at the end of the third. Maynooth Report, p. 13 ; and p. 60, "There is an annual ordination (at the College) held by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin."

assertion will be evident to any one who will inspect the two Acts of the Irish Parliament by which it is governed: one entitled, "An Act for the better Education of *Persons* professing the Popish or Roman Catholic Religion (35 Geo. III. c. 21); and the other, "An Act for the better Government" of the same (40 Geo. III. c. 85). And in the preamble to the Statutes of the college, it is described by the trustees as a seminary in which "*cives nostros Catholicæ Romanæ religionis cultores ad pietatem artesque bonas informari oporteat.*" And, in fact, a '*Lay College*' has already existed as a part of the institution of Maynooth. The whole number of its students destined for the ecclesiastical career amounts usually to about 400<sup>2</sup>. And its importance may be estimated from the fact, stated by its late president, that it supplies at least *five-eighths*<sup>3</sup> of the Roman Catholic priesthood of Ireland.

In order to understand the real character and tendencies of the establishment, it is necessary to examine not only the *text-books* which it authorizes and employs, but, what is of infinitely greater importance, the condition and obligations of those who *teach* from these text-books; we must inquire, in short, what is the *personal* organization and working of the Institution.

Let it be remembered, then, that the whole Executive of Maynooth is virtually and unreservedly in the hands of the *titular hierarchy of Ireland*. The

<sup>1</sup> Maynooth Report, p. 50. 59. 91.    <sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 51.    <sup>3</sup> Ibid. p. 51.

Government is vested in *Trustees*, who are<sup>1</sup> a *self-elected body*; no control can be exercised by the Civil Power, either subsequently or antecedently, over their election; and, as its late President Dr. Crotty informs<sup>2</sup> us, this board of *Trustees* consists “always of *eleven Bishops* and *six Laymen*,” the “*four Archbishops* being always *Trustees*.” Besides the *Trustees* there are indeed seven *Visitors*, four of whom are Judges of the realm; who hold *Visitations* once in three years, but the *general* powers vested in the entire body do not extend to matters connected with religion: all these are left in the hands of the *Roman Catholic Visitors*, who (as in the cases of Dr. Curtis and Dr. Murray) are sometimes *Trustees* as well as *Visitors*. The *Trustees* elect the *Professors*, all of whom, from the foundation to 1826, the year preceding that of the Maynooth Report (with two exceptions), have been Ecclesiastics.

Now, these things being borne in mind, let it also be remembered that the *Bishops* of Ireland are appointed by the *Pope*, that they nominate the *Professors* at Maynooth, that they have supreme control over its doctrine and discipline, that they appoint to all the spiritual cures in their respective dioceses, and that five-eighths of the future *Priests* of Ireland are trained at Maynooth. Let it also be recollected that “the *four Archbishops*” cannot exercise even Episcopal functions, before they receive their *Pallium* from *Rome*<sup>3</sup>; that all the *Bishops* are bound to the *Pope*, first, by subscription

<sup>1</sup> Maynooth Report, p. 18.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 49.

<sup>3</sup> Foreign Report, p. 427. See also below, p. 40.



of the Trent Creed and by the Trent oath to him as *Priests*; and secondly, by a most solemn one of subjection and fidelity to him as *Bishops*. Thus we have a correct notion of the extent and power of the Papal influence, *through* Maynooth, over Ireland generally, and peculiarly and directly *upon* Maynooth itself. We do not hesitate, then, to affirm, that the mainspring of the machine is no other than the Pope himself. The British Nation pays for Maynooth, and the Pope governs it. And may it not now be justly required, that either the Nation should cease to support, or the Pope cease to rule it? Certainly the question must and will be asked, whether it is fit that in the nineteenth century an *addition* should be made to this tax of *Peterpence*, already levied in Protestant England, for the aggrandizement of the Pope's power in these realms, to the detriment of the British Monarchy?

Maynooth is *called* a *Royal* College, but it is in reality a *Papal* one; and to comprehend its principles we must study the genius of the Papacy when acting in its native character, as it does in Ireland, and upon a country wrested, as it pretends, from its own grasp by those whom it denounces as heretics; and when that country is *Ireland*, which is asserted by Popes<sup>1</sup> (as indeed England also) to stand in a peculiar relation, that of a feudal possession, to the Roman See. To know Maynooth, I say, we must know Rome; and that we may fall into no error in

<sup>1</sup> Maynooth Report, 191. 203. 205, and below, Note P.



our description of her claims, let us set down no other account than that which Rome gives of herself. For the delineation of the Papacy let us borrow the hand of Popes, tracing its features in their own official character, and publishing by their own authority<sup>1</sup> this portraiture to the world, a portraiture standing at this hour, without any softening touches or qualifying shadows, in their own laws, and from generation to generation illustrated and amplified by their own acts.

Let us not, then, be termed unreasonable or uncharitable. We quote from books which the Pope himself *commands*<sup>1</sup> us to receive, and in which he assures us, that however other things may change, he is unchanged and unchangeable. We quote from books<sup>1</sup> which Maynooth honours, and teaches to be honoured by its students: and if, therefore, we are uncharitable to the Pope, it is because we give credence to his assertions with respect to himself; it is because we do not believe him to be false although he is fallible, while the charity of Maynooth towards him (if they reject our assertions) will consist in vindicating him by means of suppositions which make him not only fallible but false.

Let us examine, then, what the Pope promulgates concerning himself. "To be subject to the Bishop of

<sup>1</sup> The Canon Law, printed and published "*jussu Pontificis*," which has a Professor of its own at the College of Maynooth. Report, p. 211. 215. And "*jubemus* (says Greg. XIII. in his preface, A.D. 1582) 'ut omnia diligentissimè retineantur.'"

Rome he declares to be necessary to salvation," and be it observed in proof that this subjection is not, as is pleaded, in *spirituals* only, he asserts in the same edict that the spiritual power can constitute and depose the earthly, assuming to himself the language of God to the prophet<sup>1</sup>, "Behold, I have set thee over the nations, and over the kingdoms, to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, to build, and to plant." Witness further the practical proof which he himself gave, and declares in his laws that he has given, that he claims this power to himself. He refers to the act of the Pontiff "who deposed the King of the Franks, and gave his throne to another; and he asserts that the exercise of this power is his own ordinary privilege." Witness, again, the example of that Gregory who deposed the Emperor Henry the Fourth, and of that Innocent who dethroned King John, and of that Paul who attempted to dethrone Henry the Eighth<sup>2</sup>, and of that Pius who pretended to depose Elizabeth<sup>3</sup>, and who commanded her subjects to rise in rebellion against her.

Lest also these should be said to be extraordinary and irregular acts, Rome has identified herself for ever with them, by canonizing three of these Popes, and by enrolling them amongst her Saints, where they stand at this day. Again; though all times are

<sup>1</sup> Jer. i. 10.

<sup>2</sup> Bullarium Rom. vi. p. 129.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. vii. p. 99.

the same with her who claims the proud titles of infallible and unchangeable, and therefore what she did five hundred years ago, is, by her own assertion, but an act of yesterday; yet, lest we should think that the assertion of this power lies dormant, be it remembered that she canonized only in the last century him<sup>1</sup> who had anathematized Elizabeth: and, about the same time, as if she were afraid that we should forget, through lapse of time, the acts of Hildebrand, she, even six hundred years after they had been performed, composed a solemn religious service, set forth by one of her Popes<sup>2</sup>, in his honour, in which she claims for him the homage of Saints, because “he resisted the power of the Emperor and deprived him of the Communion of the faithful and of his Crown.” The same Pius the Fifth, who excommunicated, and pretended to depose Elizabeth, inserted fresh anathemas in the bull entitled, “*In Cæna Domini*,” in which the Popes condemn all who restrain the plenitude of their power, and denounce fearful curses and punishments on all Protestants; a bull which, in its sanguinary character, stands among the most tremendous of the Papal edicts; while, further, we have the testimony in writing of a Cardinal<sup>3</sup> of the Church of Rome, the Secretary of the Pope, and the promoter of the faith, to a countryman of our own that “this bull,” I quote the Cardinal’s own language, “*is implicitly in vigour in all*

<sup>1</sup> A. D. 1712.

<sup>2</sup> Benedict XIII. Sept. 25, 1728.

<sup>3</sup> Appendix, Note K.

*its extension.*" These words were written only fifty-two years ago.

Again, in their own code of law, the Popes of Rome assert their right "to release subjects from their allegiance," and to "dispense with their oaths;" and what value, therefore, may be set on their oaths of civil allegiance to a temporal sovereign, is thence manifest, since, also, in the same code they affirm that their own power is paramount to the royal, as much as the sun is to the moon: especially do they declare that oaths taken by spiritual persons to laics, from whom they receive no temporalities, (the case of the Irish Titular Bishops, and therefore of the Maynooth Trustees,) are null and void, and that oaths taken to excommunicated persons, and, therefore, to Protestant Sovereigns, by the bull above cited,—(again, the case of the same hierarchy,)—are no oaths, and that no allegiance is to be paid to such persons; that oaths to the prejudice of the See of Rome, (again the case of the said Bishops,) are "not oaths but perjuries;" and that any ecclesiastic who has taken such an oath, "may resist his prince for the sake of the honour of his Church, or his own private advantage."

These are the official declarations of the Popes of Rome in their own laws, which they affirm to be like those of the Medes and Persians; and in order that our assertions, with respect to them, may be verified, we have set them down, one by one, elsewhere<sup>1</sup>. And if now it should be alleged that these claims are antiquated and obsolete—allowing, as we gladly

<sup>1</sup> Appendix, Note L.



do, with thankfulness to God, that the *exercise* of them has been made less easy, since the world has had experience of the misery consequent upon it,—(and Heaven forbid that we should incur the guilt, and be even partners in the shame, of giving them new life and energy!) it is by no means through any *change* in the *Papacy* itself that this has become so.

What evidence, we enquire, can be brought of any symptoms of variation there? But we are told, by Bishops of the Church of Rome, and Trustees of Maynooth, that a change *has* taken place. Has she then ceased to be infallible? Is Rome no longer Rome? And if so, why do they, almost at the same moment, point to her (to use their<sup>1</sup> own words) as “like her Divine Founder, yesterday, and to-day, and *always, the same*, until the consummation of all things?” And who are they, that we should believe them, in their *private* opinions concerning Rome, and yet *reject* her own public declarations concerning herself? Has she ever revoked a single word, or cancelled a single iota of her claims? Has she not, as we have seen, re-said, re-written, and re-inforced them continually? Has she not rebuked these her apologists when they have pretended to surrender the direct<sup>2</sup>, and much more the indirect, power of the Pope in temporal matters, and his claim to depose Princes<sup>3</sup>?

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Doyle's Pastoral Address, 1824.

<sup>2</sup> Pope Sixtus V. put the work of Cardinal Bellarmine, de Pontifice, into the *Index Expurgatorius* for this reason.

<sup>3</sup> Appendix, Note DD.

If *she had* abandoned these claims, would she not have renounced them? and have thus disarmed those Governments of their fears, who now exclude her from their soil, and so have won to herself a readier entrance where, most of all, for her own sake, she desires to penetrate? But even with this strong inducement to abandon them, she still clings to them with unremitting tenacity. And does she not make invidious comparisons between the *changes* of us Protestants and her *own immutability*; between *our concessions to her*, and *her own inflexibility to us*? Will she not therefore receive, with a proud and contemptuous smile, the proposed grant to Maynooth, as a homage from us to the truth of her assertions with respect to her indestructible rights, and as a proof of our desire and need to submit ourselves, at any sacrifice, to her unrelenting power?

Obsolete and antiquated, then, if we will, let these principles be *to us*, they are not obsolete and antiquated *to her*, or *to those* who teach them within the walls of Maynooth; and who recognize in them their own dignity, and who will perceive, or think they perceive, in *our encouragement* of them, the harbingers of their own future triumph, and of the aggrandizement of that power, of which they are the sworn and devoted adherents!

Yes, we say, the functionaries of Maynooth have chosen to enlist themselves in the service of the Pope, and are not the subjects of the Crown; for, in the language of a Roman Catholic Archbishop<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Archbp. de Marca, Concordia, vi. c. 7.

himself, “the Episcopal Oath to the Pope is that of *fealty*, which a *vassal* is bound to pay to his Lord;” and it cannot be said that these oaths are antiquated or obsolete; every one of the eleven Episcopal Trustees of Maynooth, every Romanist Bishop in Ireland, is a living witness to the contrary.

We have said that every Romanist Bishop, and therefore the eleven Episcopal of the fifteen Trustees of Maynooth, has bound himself to the Bishop of Rome by the most solemn obligation of subjection and obedience; and we now offer proof of this assertion. He is bound, first (as *Priest*), by *oath*, to observe the Tridentine Creed, which, as a late Trustee of Maynooth states, is “the most authentic summary of the Creed of the Roman Catholic Church <sup>1</sup>.”

By this oath (which is to be taken by all Ecclesiastics,)—

1. He “vows and swears *true obedience* to the Roman Pontiff, the successor of St. Peter, *the Vicar of Jesus Christ*.”
2. He “unhesitatingly receives and professes all things decreed in the *Sacred Canons* and General Councils, especially by the Holy Synod of Trent, and rejects and anathematizes all things contrary thereto.”
3. “This true faith, out of which is no salvation, he vows and swears to hold firm to death, and to take care that it be *held* and *taught*, as far as in him lies, by all under his care.”

<sup>1</sup> Appendix, Note M. See also Note N.

Such are his obligations as *Priest*; secondly, as *Bishop*, he swears<sup>1</sup>,—

1. "To be *faithful* and *obedient* to his Lord (Dominus), our Lord the Pope."
2. "To consent to nothing by which any injury may be offered to him under any pretence whatever."
3. "To defend and maintain the *Papacy* and the *Royalties of St. Peter* (saving his order) against all men."
4. "To preserve and increase the rights, honour, privileges, and authority of his Lord."
5. "To hinder and reveal any thing contrary to the same."
6. "To observe the *Canons* and *Decrees* of the See of Rome, and cause them to be observed with all his might."

Such are the obligations under which the Episcopal Trustees of Maynooth lie.

It will here probably be alleged, that the oath of these titular bishops is restrained by a clause, which, by permission of the Pope, was added to it in 1791, and that after having been given over by the above oath, as vassals to the Pope, they are suddenly recovered to the Crown, by the words at its close, as

<sup>1</sup> Pontificale Romanum, printed at Rome, ed. 1818, p. 63. The same Pontifical, p. 87, orders that no *Archbishop*, and therefore not one of the four titular Archbishops of Ireland, (all Trustees of Maynooth, see above, p. 31,) shall exercise any function of their Order, such as ordaining Priests, &c., before they receive the *Pallium* from Rome. See also Foreign Report, p. 427, concerning the *Pall* and oath of Irish *Archbishops*.



follows:—"All and every one of these things I will observe the *more inviolably*, as being certain that nothing is contained in them which can interfere with the fidelity due from me to the Most Serene Queen of Great Britain and Ireland."

Would to Heaven that there were any such retrieving power in this clause! but I fear the fisherman of the Vatican has too strong a hook to allow his prey to be wrested from him by such a feeble jerk as this. First of all it is to be remembered that, as we learn from the Cardinal Prefect Antonelli's Letter<sup>1</sup>, dated Rome, 23rd June, 1791, to Dr. Troy and "the Lords Archbishops of the Kingdom of Ireland," "*His Holiness the Pope graciously condescended*" to allow the Bishops to comply with this *addition* to the oath, at "their<sup>2</sup> humble request," and by "permission from his Holiness," at a season when Rome had much to hope from England, which she has now gained; and that they had been waiting as it were in the antechamber of the Vatican, till it should please their Sovereign Lord the Pope to give them leave to signify their attachment to the Crown; and that therefore, even in *professing* themselves the *Queen's subjects*, they are in fact the *Pope's servants*: and they know full well, for he has publicly told them in his own Laws (as we have shown) what *his* opinion of the value of oaths of his ecclesiastics to lay heretics is; and, if any case should arise where the Pontifical

<sup>1</sup> Foreign Report, p. 427.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 427, 428.

interest should clash with the Royal, they know that it has been already ruled there by the Pope, that "oaths to the prejudice of the Church are perjuries, and not oaths;" and they know also that the same power which gave them leave to take the oath with this addition, can dispense with the addition, whenever he pleases, and absolve them from all its consequences.

We observe, also, that whatever effect this additional clause might have on the oath taken by them as *Bishops*, it can have none on that by which they have been long since bound to the Pope as *Priests*; next we say, that the Pope "was graciously pleased" to *permit* the *Bishops* to consent to this addition to the oath, but that he has never *permitted himself* to unsay a single clause of it or of any other oath or statute, which regards their allegiance to him; and that (by a mode of reasoning, of which we shall give specimens hereafter,) the addition of this clause is in fact a *ratification* and *confirmation* of the oath, even on the part of the *civil power*; for the *addition*, to which the civil power was a party, implies its *cognizance* and *approval* of *that* to which the addition was made. The addition, *to be made*, indicated defect; but *when made*, it argues perfectness.

And, lastly, to examine the addition itself. The only obligation it imposes is to keep all the preceding part *more inviolably* (a somewhat ill-omened phrase,

as if there could be *degrees* in *inviolability*), “because the party taking the oath is certain that there is nothing in the oath which interferes with the allegiance due (*fidelitas debita*) from him to the Sovereign.” Here we observe, that, what the nature and extent of the allegiance due from the Bishops to the *Pope* is, we know; for the *Pope* has told us; and it is declared fully in the body of the Oath, in which they swear that they will maintain his interests “*against all men* ;” but of the *nature* and *degree* of allegiance which they think due to the *Sovereign*, we know only this, that the measure of all their possible allegiance is already filled up to overflowing in what the *Pope* orders them to pay *to him*, and which they have just *sworn* to pay *him*, and that they have *no surplus at their disposal* ; and so, the vessel of allegiance being *full*, this clause is a mere bubble on the surface, which a child’s breath can blow away.

Further, they will plead that the civil power, having shown its cognizance of, and concession to, these their prior and paramount obligations, has at least *acquiesced* in this disposal of duty ; and that, whether it does so or no, it would, they will affirm, be preposterous, if the *addition* were not to be construed with, and made conformable and subordinate to, the whole tenour and substance of the oath, and not the tenour and substance be made to bend to the addition. No ; the tail must follow the body, and not lead it ; according to the *Pope’s* own maxims, “*Qui prior tempore, potior jure* ;” and “*In obscuris,*

quod est verisimilius, eligendum ;” and again, “ *Utile non debet per inutile vitiari* <sup>1</sup>.”

The only effect then of the addition (as might have been expected from a clause sanctioned by the Pope) is to *strengthen* the Oath ; or, in its own words, to render it “ *more inviolable* <sup>2</sup>.”

And, may it not now be inquired, by the way,—if we, a Protestant People, (being fully aware, as we are or ought to be, of these circumstances,) are induced to afford additional honour, power, and encouragement to those who are so bound, and whom *we know* to be so bound,—do we not, in fact, give our voices and our money to endow and aggrandize the Papacy, to the subversion of the honours and rights of our beloved Sovereign, and to the destruction of our own peace?—But more of this presently.

It may, however, be said, that it being true that this clause may be overruled by such considerations as these, and become void and nugatory, yet that an absolute and independent Oath of Allegiance to the Crown is taken by the Trustees of Maynooth, according to the provisions of the Act of Foundation (35 Geo. III. c. 21, sect. 8), and that in this Oath (13 and 14 Geo. III. c. 35,) they have sworn,—

1. “ To bear *true allegiance* to their most gracious *Sovereign*.
2. To do their utmost endeavours to *disclose* and make known to him all *treasons* and traitor-

<sup>1</sup> Regulæ Juris (Jus Canonicum, cap. v. tit. xii. in sexto).

<sup>2</sup> Appendix, Note O.



ous conspiracies that may be formed *against him*.

3. That they *renounce, reject, and abjure* the *opinion* that Princes *excommunicated* by the Pope may be *deposed* or murdered by their subjects.
4. That they do *not* believe that the *Pope* hath, or ought to have, any temporal or civil *jurisdiction*, directly or indirectly, within this *realm* :
5. And that they make this declaration without any mental *reservation* or *dispensation* granted by the Pope ;
6. And without *thinking* that they are or can be *absolved* of this declaration, although the Pope shall dispense with this declaration, or declare that it was void from the beginning."

These are indeed most solemn engagements : they are of so awful and sacred a character that we cannot speak or think of the condition of those who make them without feelings of the deepest commiseration, and without prayers to Almighty God, that they may, in His own good time, be delivered from that fearful conflict of conscience and painful agony of spirit, by which they must even be torn and rent asunder, if they consider under what solemn obligations, of a different and opposite kind, they already lie, when these other oaths and protestations proceed out of their mouths. But, however this may be, still we, as Christians, as their brethren, have a duty of charity to perform ; the duty, I mean, of not plung-

ing them deeper in the abyss, and suffocating them in the waves of perplexity into which they are already entered ; the duty of not adding to their misery, by telling them that they are in a safe harbour and in calm waters ; and of not aiding to drown them by loading them with our approval and encouragement, and by speaking peace to them, when they are in the gall of bitterness and bond of iniquity.

We make little or no doubt that for thus speaking we shall, by some, be called uncharitable ; let it be so. If we are doing a *work* of charity, it matters little what *name* it bears ; and therefore we earnestly remind these our fellow-countrymen and fellow-Christians, that when they are about to take these oaths, they are going to affirm concerning the Pope things diametrically opposite, as they well know, to what the Pope has declared concerning himself. And are we, then, uncharitable if we *believe him* who is unchangeable, and out of whose communion, as they assert, there is no salvation ? Are we uncharitable when we believe *their own* other solemn and prior assertions that they “ will observe all his canons and decrees,” and “ cause them to be observed by others ?” Are we uncharitable if we believed them when they swore “ that they would maintain his rights and prerogatives against all men ?” Does he not claim the power of deposing kings, of dispensing with oaths, of absolving from allegiance, as his own rights and prerogatives ? They know that he does. If, then, we *are* uncharitable, *they themselves* have made us so.

Do we do them injustice when we declare them to be what they themselves have proved themselves to be by their own oaths, viz., under a prior paramount obligation to the Pope of the most solemn kind? Rather are *they* not *uncharitable to themselves*, for *being* in fact, by their own deed, what *we* only *affirm* from their words they must be? They ask us, Do you pretend that after we have taken this oath of civil allegiance, we can be false to the Crown?—do you impute to us treachery and perfidy? But we ask them, Are we, then, to think that you can be false to the *Pope*,—to him whose sworn vassals you are,—to him who can make you martyrs, and canonize you as Saints,—to him who can release you from all oaths but those which you take to himself? Are we to think that you consider an Act of Parliament of yesterday to be of equal force with your canons of councils of five hundred years' standing? But you reply, that you swear in the oath of allegiance, that you do not *think* (a somewhat dubious and feeble term in so great a matter) that the Pope can release you from your oaths; but if you *do believe* in your heart that the Pope *can* release you (for which you have the Pope's own authority,—into whose will all your wills are to be resolved,)—are we uncharitable if we think that you believe that he can release you from *this* oath also? You swear, indeed, that you do not believe that you can be absolved from your oath of civil allegiance, but you know that the Pope has declared all oaths taken to heretics by his eccle-

siastics to be null and void ; and that all oaths to the prejudice of Rome are perjuries. Are we, then, uncharitable if we think that you believe the Pope, who has cancelled all such oaths ? and that therefore you believe that your own assertion that they are not null, has been already cancelled, as if it was never made ?

But again, supposing you really to believe, as you swear in the oath of civil allegiance that you do, that the Pope possesses no such power of deposition and dispensation, then we say to you, Are we uncharitable if we wish you to be delivered from your subjection to that power which assumes those high and (as you must now think them) monstrous claims of which you condemn and denounce the assumption ? Are we doing you an injury, if we labour to deliver you from your hard and unholy bondage to it ? Are we guilty of hatred towards you if we are not willing to *rivet* your *chains* ?

And, still more, if the Pope himself, as you sometimes plead, does not *now* any longer pretend to the right of deposing kings, and of dispensing with oaths of allegiance, particularly to heretical princes, and to those who lie under the ban of excommunication, then we say, What a hard master is it your miserable lot to serve ! how cruel and tyrannical to his own children and to his devoted vassals is he who calls himself the Father of the Faithful and the Vicar of Christ, since he allows them to lie in such distress and perplexity of conscience, and under the suspicion of the guilt of treachery and perjury, from which he



might clear them by one slight movement of his pen, or by a single sentence from his mouth !

Accuse not, therefore, *us* of uncharitableness ; but accuse *him*. The fault lies not with us ; it lies with *him* who permits the world at large to remain in a grievous error (*if* error it be) with respect to himself, which has caused, and (unless God's mercy should interfere to prevent it) will continue to cause, endless strife and misery, and anarchy, and confusion, and bloodshed in the world ; from all which, both past and future, if he had vouchsafed, or would vouchsafe, to utter a single syllable, he might have preserved us.

But we allow that we ourselves are far from being innocent in this matter. We know that we are guilty of folly and even of sin in supposing that when called to take the Oath of Allegiance, as Trustees of Maynooth, the titular Bishops of Ireland are free men. We know their prior obligations, and we are not ignorant of their opinion with respect to them. Our greatest *charity* would be, to look upon them and to treat them as what they are, subjects and vassals of the Pope ; to remember that *they themselves have made their choice* which master they will serve ; and as *long as they are* such as *they have made themselves*, it is as impossible for the Crown to procure from them the allegiance due from subjects to itself, as it was for Esau to obtain from his father the blessing of the birth-right, after it had been given to Jacob. This, I say, would have been our true wis-

dom, and honesty, and charity; and whatever we do in opposition to this principle, must be to violate the rights of conscience and the laws of God.

We have indeed cause to take no little share of the guilt to ourselves, which leads to reasoning of the following kind, which we know is not uncommon with the Titular Bishops, with respect to the Oath of Allegiance. The Trustee of Maynooth when called upon to take that oath, knows well that the State *cannot* be, or *if* it is, *ought* not to be, *ignorant* of his *former engagements* to *another paramount power*; and therefore must be aware that he will *construe* the Oath of Allegiance with reference and in subordination to his prior obligation to the Papal authority, and that all the clauses of this subsequent oath will be made conformable and secondary to the previous one. And to cite an instance of this mode of interpretation,—One of the clauses of the Oath of Allegiance to be taken by the Trustees, as has been before stated <sup>1</sup>, is that they will do their utmost endeavour to *disclose* to the Sovereign all *treasons* against her. Now one of the late Trustees of Maynooth <sup>2</sup>, Dr. Doyle, being asked, in a Committee of the House of Lords, “whether this clause obliged him to discover any treason against the Sovereign, with which he might have become acquainted in *Confession*,” replied, “*No*.” And mark the reason which he gave: “*As* our rite of *Confession*,” he said, “*is known* to the *laws*, and our

<sup>1</sup> Page 43.

<sup>2</sup> Appendix, Note Q.

doctrines with respect to it (as to inviolable secrecy) are universally *acknowledged* to exist in our Church," therefore this clause does not oblige us to do so. The Oath of Civil Allegiance is then, we see, according to the Bishop's theory, to be construed with, and made subordinate to, "the *Roman doctrine* with respect to *Confession*;" and why? "*because this doctrine is known to the laws.*"

Now we venture to say that the claim of the Pope to *dispense* with *oaths*, to *absolve* from *allegiance*, and to *dethrone kings* is infinitely better "*known to the laws*," in this sense of the term,—and the Pope has taken care that it should be so, both by his words and deeds,—than the Roman doctrine with regard to *Confession*. The Oath of Allegiance, therefore, according to this theory, is to be construed together with these claims of Rome, and the State being cognizant of them, cannot complain that civil allegiance is not paid to it; or, if it *does* complain, the fault lies with itself, not with Rome; for as the Romish maxims declare "*Si populus vult decipi, decipiat*;" and, "*Scienti et consentienti* (and we may add, if we *augment* the grant to Maynooth, *honore et stipendio ampliore afficienti*,) *non fit dolus neque injuria* <sup>1</sup>."

And not to rest even here, what do the *Maynooth Professors themselves* (they who have sworn in this oath, that the Pope has no dispensing power, and

<sup>1</sup> Jus Canonicum, p. 1048. Regulæ Juris XXVII. Appendix, Note R.

that they cannot be absolved from their oaths of allegiance,) what do they *teach* on this subject? It is well known that the two works, one on Moral the other on Dogmatic Theology, which are the text-books at Maynooth, and are in the hands of all the students, are those of Bailly and De la Hogue<sup>1</sup>, the latter of whom was Professor of both Moral and Dogmatic Theology at that College. Also, Dr. Mc Hale (now Titular Archbishop of Tuam and a Trustee of Maynooth), and Dr. Anglade<sup>2</sup>, occupied the place of Professors of those sciences, in the same seminary, and had, therefore, taken the Oath of Allegiance, the one having been a Professor, from 1802, for upwards of twenty years, the other from 1820 to 1825. And now, we ask, what do these *Books* and *Professors* teach with regard to the dispensing power? In Bailly's Moral Theology, page 119, are *seven causes* stated as excusing from the obligation of an oath, and five causes as taking it away altogether. One of the *excusing causes* (*causæ excusantes*) is, the hindrance of a *greater good opposed to the thing sworn*. The following question being proposed to Dr. Anglade<sup>3</sup> by the Commissioners of Irish Education Enquiry, "*Who is to be the judge of the greater good?*" he replied, "If it is on a religious matter *the Ecclesiastical Superior*." And one of the *causæ tollentes* alleged by Bailly, being the cancelling of the oath by the party to whom the

<sup>1</sup> Appendix, Note S.

<sup>2</sup> Maynooth Report, p. 1. 76.

<sup>3</sup> Maynooth Report, p. 159—164.



person swearing, or the matter of the oath sworn, is subject, the same Professor being interrogated, allows that "it is not possible for an oath to bind to the detriment of a third person."

And now to proceed to Dr. Mc Hale<sup>1</sup>. It is laid down in Bailly's Class Book, p. 140, that there is in the Church a power of absolving from oaths, and this power is founded on Matthew xviii. 18: "*Quæcunque solveritis in terris,*" &c. "Do you," was the question to Dr. Mc Hale, "attach that meaning to the word *solveritis*?" "Yes," was the reply; "I think it may be susceptible of the meaning of *dispensing with oaths.*"

"We find it laid down in page 145 of that Class Book, (rejoined the Commissioners of Enquiry to whom the public is greatly indebted,) that the following are just causes of dispensation, viz.

"1. Honour of God. 2. The Utility of the Church. 3. The common good of the Republic. 4. The common good of Society;"

"Who then is to be judge of what the *Utility of the Church* may require?"

"The *Superiors of the Church,*" was Dr. Mc Hale's reply.

"When you say that the Church has the power of dispensing with oaths, do not you mean the Superiors of the Church, and *particularly the Pope*?"

"The Pope and the Bishops," was the answer.

"In some cases the Bishops?"

"Yes."

<sup>1</sup> Appendix, Note T.

“But in all the Pope?”

“Yes; that is in those cases in which they are dispensable <sup>1</sup>.”

I think it may be very fairly concluded on the whole, after the declarations of the Pope concerning his own powers,—after the oath which the Bishops have taken to him, after the specimens we have seen of the application of the principle of *constructive interpretation*, and of the professorial teaching at Maynooth by those who have taken the oath to the Civil Power, who were appointed to their offices by the Trustees, and of the language of the Class Books which they employ,—that as long as the Trustees of Maynooth, who are *hands* of the *Pope*, remain connected with, and subject, as they now are, to him, and as long as the locks of the dispensing and absolving power of their *Head* remain unshorn, *so long all* the Oaths of Civil Allegiance that ever have been, or ever can be, devised, are as weak and powerless to bind them as the green withs in the hands of Samson.

Bearing in mind now, as we have said, that the Titular Bishops of Ireland are appointed to their sees by the Pope, and are bound to him by the solemn obligations which we have specified, and that the appointments of the Instructors at Maynooth are in the hands of the Trustees, (eleven of whom, out of fifteen, are Titular Bishops,) and that they are a *self-*

<sup>1</sup> Maynooth Report, 283, 284. 286.

*elected body*, and that Maynooth educates *five-eighths* of the Roman Catholic Clergy, even at *this* time, and that *all* the Roman Catholic Priests of Ireland are appointed to their Cures by the Bishops, we may now form some fair and reasonable estimate of the power which the Pope exercises *at present* over *Ireland through Maynooth*, and make some tolerable conjecture as to the *addition* which we shall give to his power *hereafter*, if by an *augmentation* of the annual grant we afford increased encouragement and influence to that seminary.

May we not almost say, that if King James the First had given an order for a supply from the *Government Ordnance stores*, of a cargo of some additional barrels of gunpowder to Guy Fawkes and his associates, with an Order of Council, under the royal sign manual, requiring them to deposit them carefully under the Houses of Parliament, and had made a point of going down to the House, accompanied by his royal family and the court, on the day agreed on between himself and the conspirators, and of taking his position on the throne at the hour preconcerted for the explosion, he would *have* done very much that which the country *will* do, *if* it should unhappily be persuaded to augment the grant of its own money to Maynooth?

But to resume our examination of the political teaching of Maynooth. The first of the four Gallican Articles affirms, as we have seen, the complete independence of the Civil Power in temporal matters.

“Les Rois et les Princes (are its words), quant au temporel, ne sont soumis par l'ordre de Dieu à aucune Puissance Ecclésiastique, et ne peuvent directement ni indirectement être déposés par l'autorité des Clefs, ni leurs sujets être dispensés de l'obéissance, ou absous du serment de fidélité.” Let us see what has been the fate of these Articles at Maynooth; and we shall then be able to form a correct judgment of its services to the State, and of its claims to be selected for remuneration, honour, encouragement and aggrandizement, from the Country.

Since the relation of the Trustees of Maynooth to the Pope is such as it has been shown to be; since the Popes have ever vehemently opposed the doctrine of the Gallican Articles, from the time of Innocent XIth, in whose pontificate they were published; since that Pope addressed two briefs, in terms of the most distinguished approval and collaudation, to Rocaberti, the Grand Inquisitor of Spain, who published an elaborate treatise (in three volumes folio), on the Authority of the Pope, in 1691, at Valencia, in direct opposition to the Gallican Articles of 1682, in which work Rocaberti denounces “as *impious, heretical, and schismatical*, the *doctrine of the independence of Kings in temporalities*,” and since these eulogistic briefs of the Pope are prefixed to the work of Rocaberti<sup>1</sup>; since also, as we have seen, Dr. Milner (the accredited organ of the Irish titular hierarchy in

<sup>1</sup> Dupin's Manuel, p. xx.



their proceedings with the Government concerning the *Veto* <sup>1</sup>), declared that there was “not one of the Roman Catholic Bishops of Ireland who was not resolved to *reject* the Gallican Articles;” and since they *did* formally reject them <sup>2</sup>, it seems reasonable, *à priori*, to presume that the persons appointed by them to fill the professorial chairs at Maynooth, would not be devoted adherents of the British Protestant Monarchy, inasmuch as their electors reject the Articles which Bossuet and his brother Prelates, attached as they were to Rome, thought necessary for the security of the Gallican throne, and which every Government in France, from that day to this, has ordered to be subscribed and maintained by every Professor in the Roman Catholic Seminaries of that country.

But it may be asked, Do not the Statutes of Maynooth require that these doctrines should be there taught? Certainly, by implication, they do. “Let the Professor of *Dogmatic Theology*,” they say, “strenuously exert himself to impress on his class, that the allegiance, which they owe to the Sovereign, cannot be relaxed or annulled by any authority whatever <sup>3</sup>.”

But here, alas! I am afraid we have another instance of the futility of all such provisions and expedients, when the interests of the Papal authority are concerned. The Statutes of Maynooth do, in-

<sup>1</sup> Digest, ii. 214.

<sup>2</sup> See above, p. 24.

<sup>3</sup> Chap. v. art. 3.

deed, give the directions above cited ; but attached to those Statutes, which were *framed in 1800*<sup>1</sup>, is a rescript from the Propaganda at Rome to the Trustees of Maynooth, dated July, 1796, the year after the foundation of the College, but *four years before* the statutes existed, in which the Congregation of the Propaganda warns them against “*admitting any persons* into their collegiate body, who, induced by a false show of zeal, might think themselves at liberty to *soften down* the sacred dogmas (*emollire sacra dogmata*) and the consecrated language of those dogmas, with a view of alluring divided sects, and of conciliating them into harmony with Catholics ;” to which admonition the Trustees reply, that “they are grieved from their heart (*se ingemiscere*) that there should be any, who call themselves Catholics, who, beguiled by a false show of piety or intelligence, *attempt to soften down* any language sanctioned by the Church of Christ ;” and they assure the Propaganda that “they have received this rule of thinking and speaking from their own ancestors, than whom,” they add, “no men were ever more zealous in recognizing and maintaining the *supreme divinely instituted* jurisdiction and authority of the *Roman Pontiff* over all the faithful of Christ ;” and they conclude with affixing their names to this document, with the assumed episcopal titles of the cities of Ireland, which they claim for themselves as their respective sees ; and they publish this reply to

<sup>1</sup> Report, p. 45.

the world to the above rescript, which, in their own language, is “of prime importance to the ecclesiastical republic of Ireland.” (“Cum Reipublicæ Ecclesiasticæ in Hiberniâ *plurimum intersit*.”) Such is the first specimen which they gave of the allegiance which they had sworn to bear to the Crown; and which also (be it observed), they enjoin others to maintain: for, let it be remembered, that the *very same* Trustees, who received the above letter from the Propaganda, and who replied to it in the above terms, were also (as the preamble shows) the framers of the Statutes of Maynooth.

But to trace the evidence, with respect to their political teaching, to a lower point in its process of development:—

On the 20th of October, 1826, Dr. Crotty, then President of Maynooth, stated in evidence, afterwards revised and corrected by himself<sup>1</sup>, before the Commissioners of Irish Education Enquiry<sup>2</sup>, that the principles of Maynooth, concerning the Gallican Articles, were the same as those taught in the College at Lisbon, at which he was educated, and that the sense of that College was decidedly *against the ultramontane opinions*, and that all the four and therefore the *first* of the Gallican Articles,—that of which we are now speaking, concerning allegiance,—

<sup>1</sup> The evidence of the witnesses before the Commission of Irish Education Enquiry was in all cases subsequently revised and corrected by themselves. See Report, p. 322. 359.

<sup>2</sup> Maynooth Report, p. 79.

“were assented to *ex corde* and *ex animo* at Maynooth<sup>1</sup>.”

Now the reader will observe, that in the statutes it is declared to be the special office of the Professor of *dogmatic theology*<sup>2</sup>, “to exert himself to impress on his class, that the allegiance which they owe to the Sovereign cannot be annulled or relaxed by any authority whatsoever.”

During the presidency of Dr. Crotty, who was elected to his office in the year 1813 in the room of Dr. Murray, the titular Archbishop of Dublin, and was president in 1826 when he gave the above evidence, the Professor of Dogmatic Theology was Dr. Mc Hale, who was Dr. De la Hogue’s *locum-tenens* in the Professorship from 1814, and succeeded him in it in 1820, and remained Professor of Dogmatic Theology till 1825, so that he held that office during almost the *whole of Dr. Crotty’s presidency*. And what is *his* testimony on this subject of the Gallican Articles? Let us hear Dr. Mc Hale himself. He was examined on Nov. 7th, 1826, only about three weeks after Dr. Crotty, and he thus witnesses with respect to the teaching of Maynooth concerning the Gallican Articles and civil allegiance.

“Having no motive to be attached either to the one or the other opinion, we have *neither* taught the *ultramontane* doctrine, *nor* the *liberties* of the *Gallican Church*. I should also say, that the introduction of all the propositions of the Gallican Church

<sup>1</sup> Maynooth Report, p. 79.

<sup>2</sup> Chap. v. art. 3. See above, p. 57.



would seem to me to lessen the salutary influence of the Roman Pontiff, which we consider necessary for the interests of religion."

"I can state that the ultramontane opinions were not taught in the College of Maynooth. These opinions would be quite, in our conception, destructive of that allegiance which we owe to our gracious Sovereign : but, at the same time that I state that the ultramontane opinions were not taught in the College of Maynooth, I wish *distinctly* to declare *that we did not adopt what are generally called the opinions of the Gallican Church*, contained in the four propositions of 1682, which are connected with the Gallican liberties. The opinions of the ultramontanes would seem to us to be destructive of the authority of kings ; and the other opinions, if pressed to the consequences of which they seem to be susceptible, would appear also to be *subversive of the due independence of the Church*<sup>1</sup>."

I will offer no comment upon this evidence of Dr. Mc Hale, when contrasted with that of Dr. Crotty, but will only observe, that it does not strengthen the confidence which we should be glad to repose in the oaths of allegiance which are taken by the officers of Maynooth, and which are so frequently presented to us as infallible pledges of their loyalty, and as assurances of those beneficial results which the country derives, and will continue to derive, from their teaching.

But to proceed still further in the chain of evidence on this subject.

Dr. Murray, the titular Archbishop of Dublin, both a Trustee and Visitor of the College, was President of Maynooth in 1812, and being asked whether

<sup>1</sup> Maynooth Report, p. 317.

“Mr. Kenney was not Vice-President of Maynooth during the year that he was President?”, “Yes,” he replied, “I was so happy as to have been able to procure his valuable assistance during part of that time<sup>1</sup>.” Mr. Kenney informs us that his duties at Maynooth were “to be the *representative of the President* when he *was absent*, (which appears to have been not unfrequently the case with the President, he being Coadjutor Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin at that time,) and to assist him in the general government of the house.” And such indeed are declared to be the functions of the Vice-President, in the third chapter of the Statutes of the College. Mr. Kenney being asked where he was educated, replied, that he studied in *Palermo*<sup>2</sup>; and being requested to state, “whether the education given in *Palermo* is the same or materially different from that of *Maynooth*,” he answered, on Dec. 7th, 1826, about seven weeks after the evidence of Dr. Crotty, that “*all the principles of faith and morals are precisely the same*”<sup>3</sup>. We have just heard from Dr. Crotty that they were precisely the same as those of *Lisbon*, which he assured us was “*decidedly against ultramontane opinions*,” and now they are identical with those of *Palermo*. What then were the principles of the College of *Palermo*? and what was Mr. Kenney himself, whose services the President, Dr. Murray, tells us he “was so happy as to have been able to procure”

<sup>1</sup> Maynooth Report, p. 381.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 382.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. p. 382.

as his own colleague in governing Maynooth, and as his own representative as Head of the College in his absence? The Rev. Mr. Mc Nally, Professor of Logic at Maynooth, who was examined about six weeks before Mr. Kenney, being asked to enumerate the names of those who had been Vice-Presidents of the College during his time, mentions Mr. Kenney among them<sup>1</sup>. "Do you know," he was asked, "where Mr. Kenney is at present?" "He is at the establishment of Clongowes. He came to Maynooth with his Grace Dr. Murray, who was then President of the College: it was Dr. Murray's wish to have him on account of the high opinion he entertained of his talents and of his piety<sup>2</sup>." "Was it supposed," Mr. Mc Nally is asked, "at the time he was Vice-President, that he belonged to any particular *religious society*?" "It was supposed," is the answer, "that he was of the *Order of Jesuits*<sup>3</sup>." But to return now to Mr. Kenney's own evidence. He informs us that he was educated at the College of *Palermo*. "And was the College of Palermo at that period under the care of the Jesuits?" "Yes," is the answer, "my studies were performed in that college, which was a *College of Jesuits*<sup>4</sup>." "Do you belong to the Order of the Jesuits?" "I am a Jesuit," is the answer. It being inquired what *rank* he held in the Order of Jesuits, when he was Vice-President, "I was then," he says, "a Priest of the Order," and

<sup>1</sup> Maynooth Report, p. 142.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 143.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. p. 142.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. p. 383.

having described what the gradations in the Order are, namely, those of General, Provincial, and Local Superiors, and being requested to specify *his own rank* in the Order, he tells us that he holds the *highest place*, that of Local Superior (for there is no Provincial), in Ireland <sup>1</sup>.”

And now to say one word respecting the Institution of Clongowes, concerning which Mr. Mc Nally has spoken. We are informed by the same witness <sup>2</sup> that Mr. Kenney was its *founder*, and that he quitted Maynooth to *superintend* it. Still, however, his intercourse with Maynooth did not cease, as might be expected; for Clongowes is *only six miles from it*. As Mr. Kenney himself informs us <sup>3</sup> “he revisited Maynooth from time to time, to conduct the Spiritual Retreats<sup>4</sup>,” as they are termed, “of the students in that college.” “He also,” says Mr. Mc Nally, “composed Meditations, which were read for the students at their morning and evening devotions; and this extended *to all the students in the college*.”

Mr. William Rogers, a late student at Clongowes, and who was transferred from that school to Maynooth, being asked how many Professors there were at Clongowes, says that they “were about ten <sup>5</sup>.” And in reply to another question, answers “that the opinion among the students was, that they belonged to

<sup>1</sup> Maynooth Report, p. 394, 395. See also Appendix, Note U.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 143.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. p. 382, 383.

[<sup>4</sup> See below, p. 92, the extract from the Quarterly Review.—I add this reference in this new edition.]

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. p. 436.



a particular Religious Order:" and then ensues the following series of interrogations and replies.

"All the ten?"—"Whatever Superiors were there, the number was about ten."

"That Order was the Society of Jesus?"—"We supposed them to be Jesuits."

"Was it merely Mr. Kenney who belonged to that order, or were he and all *his assistants*, Jesuits?"—"We understood that the Superiors, who were there, were attached in one way or other to the order of Jesuits. . . . It was an understood thing between us that they were Jesuits<sup>1</sup>."

"Was there any sodality or confraternity established among the young men at *Clongowes*?"—"There was."

"Will you mention the name of it?"—"The *Sodality of the Blessed Virgin*."

"Did you belong to it?"—"I did."

"Is there any sodality established at *Maynooth* amongst the young men?"—"There is."

"Will you name it?"—"The Sodality of the *Sacred Heart*."

"Do you belong to it?"—"I do."

Mr. Kenney denies the truth of the assertion of Scipio de Ricci, late Bishop of Pistoia: "Personne n'ignore combien de machinations les *Jésuites* ont mis en œuvre pour se rétablir en corps de société. Ils ont cru que le culte *du sacré cœur* était ce qu'il y avait de plus propre à servir de centre et de point de réunion;" but we are told by Mr. Coyne, the publisher to Maynooth, that he "has heard<sup>2</sup> that the

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Crotty, the late President of Maynooth, confirms this assertion, *ibid.* p. 92.

<sup>2</sup> Maynooth Report, p. 444.

Jesuits approve more of the doctrine of the Devotions of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, than any other body of the Roman Catholic Clergy;" and in the edition of these Devotions<sup>1</sup>, published by the Stationer of Maynooth, with the approbation of Dr. Murray, the late President, *a daily Commemoration is recommended of the Founder of the Order of Jesuits.*

One word more on this same topic. We are informed by another Vice-President of Maynooth<sup>2</sup>, Mr. Montague, that there is one Commentary on Holy Scriptures, "which all the students are obliged to peruse the first year for themselves;" and *one only*, that of *Menochius*<sup>3</sup>. And what countryman was Menochius? "He was an Italian, born in the sixteenth century." But one of the late students, Mr. Dixon, goes a little further, and tells us, "The Commentary on Scripture selected by the College is by a *Jesuit*<sup>4</sup>."

So that, at last,—to sum up the evidence, as here produced, on the political teaching at Maynooth, concerning the independence of the Crown, and the nature of Civil allegiance, and of the influence to which the College is subject;—when we commence

<sup>1</sup> See p. 128 of the Devotions, 5th edit. Dublin, published by P. Blenkinsop, Stationer to the Royal College of Maynooth, "with the approbation of the Most Rev. Dr. Murray." "For the more effectual prevailing with St. Francis *Xaverius*, it will be convenient *every day* to make a special commemoration of *St. Ignatius of Loyola*."

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 108.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. p. 111.

<sup>4</sup> Appendix, Note V.

with Dr. Crotty, we hear that “the Gallican Articles are *assented to ex corde and ex animo* at Maynooth;” when we come to the Professor of Dogmatic Theology, Dr. Mc Hale, to whom, by the Statutes, the duty of inculcating right principles concerning Civil allegiance specially belongs, we find that “he wishes distinctly to declare that they did *not adopt* the *opinions of the Gallican Church* contained in the four propositions of 1682;” when we arrive at Dr. Murray, we learn that he congratulates himself, that in his presidency he “was so happy as to have been able to procure the assistance of Mr. Kenney” as *his own Colleague and Deputy* to be left in sole charge of the College in his absence; and we find that Mr. Kenney “composed meditations for all the Students of the College;” and that, after he had quitted Maynooth, he was invited to revisit it from time to time, to “conduct the spiritual Retreats of the Students there;” and when we inquire of Mr. Kenney, he answers “that the principles of faith and morals at *Maynooth* are precisely the same as those at *Palermo*,” and when we ask for information concerning the College of Palermo, we discover that “it is a *College of Jesuits*,” and that he, the Vice-President of Maynooth, is the Head of the Jesuits in Ireland; and we also learn that he has instituted a seminary at Clongowes, only *six miles from Maynooth*, from which young men are transferred to that College, and that he is the President of it, having nine other Jesuits there associated with him; and that a sodality is there

organized, of which the students are members; and we find that a similar Society, that of the Sacred Heart, connected with the Jesuits, exists at Maynooth, and that *half*<sup>1</sup> the students of the College are incorporated in it, and that thus, by means of these students, who are the future Priests of Ireland, the power and principles of the Jesuits are extending themselves into all parts of the country; and lastly, we learn that the *only* Commentary on Scripture in use as a class-book at Maynooth, is from the pen of a Jesuit<sup>2</sup>.

What then is the moral from all this? Not to dwell at length on the remarkable discrepancies in

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Crotty the President, says, (Maynooth Report, p. 109,) Nov. 1826, that "the Sodality of the Sacred Heart is not numerous; if there were *sixty* of the students at any period members of it, it probably might be the greatest number there ever was." But Mr. Philip Dowley, the Dean of the College, examined only six days after Dr. Crotty, says, that "he keeps the register of the names of the members of the Sodality of the Sacred Heart; that he is a member of it—that others of the "superiors are members;" that "it was instituted at the recommendation of *the board of the Trustees*," "by virtue of a permission obtained from *Rome* by Dr. Murray; and that about *two hundred of the students* are members of it (!)" There seems, therefore, too much ground, even from *Maynooth* alone, for the statement in the QUARTERLY REVIEW for March, 1841, p. 545, "*The Sodality of the Heart, as has been abundantly proved, is a form of Jesuitism, established with the object of attaching unconsciously to that Society numbers who would never be drawn directly into its arms.*"

<sup>2</sup> See Appendix, also, Note S. Of which Commentary, see a specimen below, Appendix, Note CC.



the testimony of the witnesses, as above cited, (and more might be added<sup>1</sup>), when contrasted together, which fills the mind with sorrow for the parties themselves, and for those who are subject to their influence, whether as Students at Maynooth under their professional training, or Priests under their episcopal superintendence, or as Laymen under their pastoral guidance and control, and with grief and shame for the country which is exposed to be the victim of their power and example, and indignation in behalf of the monarchy which is thus betrayed by those who owe to it the foundation of their institution, and of *ourselves* who are compelled to maintain it,—we cannot refrain from asserting, that if, when all these things are placed in the clear light of day before the eyes of the nation, it shall venture to award honour and distinction, instead of just censure and righteous retribution, and shall afford *enlarged resources*,—instead of *requiring an account* to be rendered of the manner in which *those already* supplied have been employed by it,—to an Institution, which has opened its doors to those who by the laws <sup>2</sup> of the realm (such is the fear entertained of their machinations) are forbidden to land on our shores, and who, if they enter the country, are to be sentenced to *banishment for life*; and has not merely

<sup>1</sup> See Note 1, p. 68.

<sup>2</sup> By 10 Geo. IV. cap. 7 (the Roman Catholic Relief Bill, 1829), any Jesuit coming into England shall, on conviction, be banished for life.

opened its doors to them, but has placed every one of its four hundred students under the uncontrolled power and influence of the leading Jesuit of Ireland, and has required them to study the pages, initiated them in the religious devotions, not to affirm has incorporated them into the secret societies, of *Jesuits* ; to an Institution which, by the assertion of *its own Vice-President*, a Jesuit himself, holds “*precisely the same principles of faith and morals as the College of Jesuits at Palermo,*”—if, we say, with these facts before its eyes, the country shall consent to *increase* the annual grant of public money to Maynooth, and thus betray itself, its monarchy, and its people, into the hands of those who are eager for their destruction, it will be guilty of its own shame and ruin, and will be the object of scorn and derision to those who will triumph in its fall.

But, it may be argued, that the good-will of the Roman Catholic Clergy of Ireland will be conciliated by the boon of an increased grant to Maynooth, that their loyalty and affections will be purchased by this act of national benevolence. Rather, let me ask, will they not consider it as a mere political expedient, and suspect and despise the authors of the gift, while they receive it from their hands? Will not the gift therefore tend more to *alienate* them, in fact, even though it may seem to *conciliate* them in appearance? will not the concession of it be assigned to *fear*, and thus the augmentation of the grant prove in effect an increase of the *cause* for fear? for will it not give fresh

strength and courage to principles and persons hostile to the monarchy, and weaken the hands, and break the hearts, of those who desire to uphold it?

Nor can it be regarded, in any sound sense of the word, as a *boon* to the *Roman Catholic Hierarchy*. It is no act of *kindness* to come forward with eager haste and smiles of approbation, in the name of the Crown and of the Country, and to award dignity and remuneration to a man who is guilty of propagating sedition and rebellion. Are we prepared to give national honours to Chartists, and to vote public thanks and pensions to Socialists? It is no *charity* to a man to confirm him in unholy and unconstitutional principles, and to endeavour to flatter him into the belief that he is acting the part of a loyal subject, and a patriotic citizen. Fine and imprisonment would be much truer charity to him than this. For this is to deprive him for ever of that which ought to be dearest and best in a man's life,—his probity and virtue: it is to incarcerate him more closely in the prison of his own vice and misery, and to prevent the possibility of his ever being emancipated from it.

Let us be permitted to refer briefly, and that with all reverence, to another solemn consideration. The voice of Scripture declares, that in the latter days there will be a falling away from the faith; and whatever less distinct notes and characters there may be of this apostasy, two there are most distinct and

most prominent. The one is *lawlessness*<sup>1</sup>, the other is *tampering with the truth*. The whole spirit and system of him “who exalteth himself above every dignity<sup>2</sup>,” is called the *mystery of lawlessness*<sup>3</sup>, the very personification of this apostasy is *the lawless one*<sup>4</sup>, and his instruments are denoted by the fearful titles of agents of evil, who “speak lies in hypocrisy, having their consciences seared with a hot iron<sup>5</sup>.” And now, since He Who is the Truth has declared that He will not deign even to cast his eyes on this “mystery of iniquity,” on this apostasy of lawlessness and lies, such is his abhorrence of it, but will “consume it with the spirit of His mouth, and destroy it with the brightness of His coming<sup>6</sup>,”—it is an act of grievous cruelty not to warn those who are entangled in a system, which has been shown to be eminently productive of those miserable fruits; and to flatter them with praise into deeper misery, and to beguile them by encouragement into irretrievable ruin.

The proposed augmentation of the grant will, therefore, we affirm, be no real boon to the Professors and Trustees of Maynooth.—But to pass from their case, and to consider that of the *students* of this Seminary.

<sup>1</sup> ἀνομία, rendered in our version *iniquity*.

<sup>2</sup> 2 Thess. ii. 4, ὑπεραιρόμενος ἐπὶ πάντων σέβασμα.

<sup>3</sup> τὸ μυστήριον τῆς ἀνομίας, (in our version, “*Mystery of iniquity*,”) 2 Thess. ii. 8.

<sup>4</sup> ὁ ἄνομος, 2 Thess. ii. 7 (in our version “that wicked”—).

<sup>5</sup> 1 Tim. iv. 3. 2 Thess. ii. 1.

<sup>6</sup> 2 Thess. ii. 8.



Maynooth educates five-eighths of the future Priests of Ireland. Their number, therefore, claims our most serious attention. And if our plea be not heard in behalf of their *Instructors*, let at least an humble appeal to the Legislature be permitted in favour of the rising generation of that country, the present and future *Students* of Maynooth.

What, I ask, have they done to deserve this grievous wrong at our hands, which we call a boon? this cruel treatment, which we call patronage, but which is, in truth, persecution? What sins have they committed, that we should proclaim to these young persons, by an Act of the Imperial Parliament, after fifty years' experience, that the training which they receive, or are about to receive, at Maynooth, deserves national confidence and demands public encouragement; that its character, tendencies, and rules are such, that while *other Institutions* are languishing for want of support, while the Protestant Bishops of Ireland have almost with one voice appealed in vain for aid in behalf of *their* seminaries, a college, which is purely Romanist, and which cannot by its laws admit a single Protestant<sup>1</sup> within its walls, should be selected as a fit object for *additional bounty*; and that while the nation is loaded with taxation and impoverished by debt, it should lavish fresh largesses on Maynooth?

In behalf then of the *Students* of Maynooth, let us

<sup>1</sup> 35 Geo. III. c. 21. sect. 9.

respectfully and earnestly intercede with the Statesmen and Legislators of the country, that this evil may be averted. Let us look a little into the condition of these Students, and we shall have a feeling (if we have hearts to feel) for their difficulties and dangers.

I cannot picture to myself a more piteous spectacle than that of the youthful Scholars of Maynooth, who are carried in troops, on stated days, to the Courts of Justice in order to take a solemn oath, which they have never before seen or heard, (and if any one desires to be made more familiar with the details of that sad process, let him read them below, where we have placed them before him<sup>1</sup>;) an oath in which they learn their true duties as citizens and subjects, which duties they there pledge themselves by oath to perform: I cannot, I say, imagine any thing more afflicting than this spectacle, when I reflect to what influence they who have bound themselves by these engagements will *hereafter* be subject, and what *other* vows they will be called upon to make, and to what consequent distress of spirit they must be reduced, and with what pangs of conscience be tormented, when they call to mind, as they must do, if their youthful hearts have not been seared and made insensible, their first vows to the Sovereign, and on their subsequent obligations to another Power.

It may indeed be said that we have a remedy for

<sup>1</sup> Appendix, Notes W. and X.

this evil, although we should give our approval and our money to Maynooth. And what is this expedient? It is to leave the students free as air, and to require from them and their instructors *no* Oaths of Allegiance at all. Then, it is said, we shall have no conflicts of conscience, no tampering with the sanctity of oaths. This would no doubt be an effective expedient; *but for what?* for the *renunciation* of *all the rights* of the *Crown* over them, and for the complete surrender of them, without a struggle, to a Foreign Power! But let us remember that the Oath of Allegiance is *not* a bad oath from any badness in itself,—no, it requires no pledge which every one subject of the British Throne is not bound and does not rejoice to give,—but the whole evil lies in the condition, present or future, of those by whom it is taken. The *withdrawal*, therefore, of it by the State would be only a public recognition that the Students and Officers of Maynooth are not citizens of England, nor subjects of the British Monarchy. It would be neither more nor less than a national declaration, that they are or will become vassals of a Foreign Power;—and in this character, forsooth, they would then present themselves before us as fit objects for fresh public encouragement, and as worthy recipients of additional bounty from the State!

It may indeed be inquired, Where then is the Roman Catholic Priesthood of Ireland to receive education, if Maynooth is not to be supported? To which question we reply, that the point before us is the wisdom

of *augmenting* its revenues, and that therefore with *that other* inquiry we are not at present concerned; but we cannot forbear observing that the titular hierarchy of Ireland, and the political leaders with whom they have associated themselves, appear to have done their utmost to prevent that question from ever being entertained.

The history of their proceedings in the discussion of the Veto Act, from 1799 to 1808<sup>1</sup>, and the final rejection on their part, not without scorn and indignation, of any controlling power of the Crown in their appointment; the insurrections<sup>2</sup> with which they threatened the country in 1817, if the power of Veto was given by Parliament to the Crown, and the renewal of similar menaces at a very recent period, have done, I say, much to render it impossible for the country to treat with them, even *if* it were willing to do so, concerning the endowments for the education or maintenance of their priesthood.

So much for the right of *Veto*; and now for that of control of *Rescripts*, *Mandates*, and *Bulls* from Rome,—a right which we have shown to be exercised by *every civil government* in *Europe* except that of England. What inducements has the Pope or the titular hierarchy of these realms ever held out to the Crown and the Country to extend to them any favour or confidence in this respect? None what-

<sup>1</sup> Appendix, Note H. I. and above, p. 26.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid, Note H. I.



ever: on the contrary, when this question was propounded to the See of Rome in 1814, the prefect of the Propaganda, Cardinal Litta, wrote in the name of the Pope to Dr. Poynter, the Vicar Apostolic of London, as follows<sup>1</sup>: “as for the examination of the rescripts, or what is called the *Regium Exequatur*, it *cannot even be made a subject of negotiation*. For your Lordship well knows that as such a practice must essentially affect the free exercise of that *supremacy of the Church* which has been given it in trust by God, it would surely be *criminal to permit*, or transfer it to *any lay power*, and indeed such a permission has *never* any where been *granted*. *If some*, and even Catholic governments, assume such rights, this is to be referred to the abuse not to the right exercise of legitimate power, which abuse, the Holy See to prevent greater evils is forced to *bear and tolerate*, but cannot *by any means approve*<sup>2</sup>.”

If then, the Titular Hierarchy have (as we see) chosen to withdraw themselves from the legitimate control of the laws, and to put themselves in a position of hostility and defiance against the just authority of the Crown, and thus voluntarily to exclude themselves from the condition of true citizens and subjects, they have no right to complain of any prejudicial consequences which are the necessary results of their own conduct.

In the mean time, the State has shown every dis-

<sup>1</sup> Foreign Report, p. 513.

<sup>2</sup> See above, p. 21.

position to afford all reasonable encouragement to their demands, and has been far from resenting their jealousy of public control, but has very recently given greater facilities for Roman Catholic endowments from private sources.

But to return to the main course of our argument, and to pass from these parties to the consideration of the position of another most important body, the *Roman Catholic Laity of Ireland*, and of the manner in which it is likely to be affected by the proposed augmentation. The exertions of a large portion of that body in behalf of the Crown of England, from the period of the Spanish invasion<sup>1</sup> to the present day, are matters of history, and beyond all praise. From that time, almost year after year, have their loyal spirits, and the elements of the soil itself and of common language and laws, and the principles of justice and of truth, working in their hearts, struggled and laboured for a vent, and yearned to testify their affection to the British Monarchy. But the power of Rome, acting through the hierarchy of Ireland, has habitually rebuked those efforts, repressed those movements, and curbed those aspirations, till at length, in 1791, a reluctant permission was *forcibly extorted*<sup>1</sup> from the Papal See, allowing the Irish Roman Catholic Laity to *express* the sentiments of love to their lawful Sovereign, which they had so long deeply felt.

<sup>1</sup> Appendix, Note U.

Since that period Maynooth has risen, and has exerted itself for fifty years to rebind the spirit which had escaped: those who best know Maynooth say that it has not laboured in vain. Indeed, from the nature of the case, it is impossible that much should not have been effected by it toward the alienation of the inhabitants of Ireland, especially of the lower orders, from the throne.

Let us see, from its own authority, what influence it claims to exercise over the lay population of Ireland. Ignatius Loyola<sup>1</sup> taught his followers that such was to be their obedience to their superior that they were to be like *baculus in manu senis*, and *perinde ac si cadaver essent*: and in a similar spirit Maynooth trains the ecclesiastics of that country to teach their flocks that the characteristic *privilege* of a *Romanist*, as *distinguished* from a *Protestant*, is, that his faith is to be resolved implicitly into the will and authority of the Priest. Dr. De la Hogue, the Maynooth teacher of Dogmatic Theology, has left on public record a statement to this effect, of such a dreadful kind, that we think it better to refer to it in his own words<sup>2</sup>, and to pass it by without giving it a more prominent place.

Suffice it only to say, that He Whose name he has there used, and Whose awful judgment he has forestalled, has told us what sentence awaits those who take refuge in the delusive sophistry, and flatter them-

<sup>1</sup> Constit. vi. c. 1. § 1.

<sup>2</sup> Appendix, Note Y.

selves with the miserable consolations of that implicit faith, which the Maynooth Professor propounds as the special blessing of the Roman Catholic Laity.

According to the Maynooth teaching, the talent committed to their trust is, in few words, to lie wrapped in a napkin. And this napkin, be it remembered, has a *triple fold*, first the *Priestly*, then the *Episcopal*, and then, over all, the *Papal*. We know what language was addressed to the servant who thus neglected to employ what was committed to his trust; but, to leave that verdict where it stands, we say that if Maynooth, which now supplies five-eighths of the Roman Catholic Clergy of Ireland, shall be enabled by the proposed augmentation to supply *six-eighths*, *seven-eighths*, or the *whole*,—if, in a word, the entire country is to become *one Maynooth*,—then we have already learnt from that College itself, what service and tribute of duty and love the laity of Ireland, thus overlaid by its superincumbent weight, will, as far as Maynooth is concerned, be willing or able to render to Cæsar, and we do not presume to enquire what it will pay to a higher power.

But to return to our own part only in this matter. After the Roman Catholic Laity of Ireland have shown such dispositions, and made such exertions to prove themselves to be loyal subjects of the Crown, and after those exertions have been checked and rebuked, and censured, and denounced by the Papacy<sup>1</sup>, shall *we* be the persons to turn round upon

<sup>1</sup> Appendix, Note V.



them and take the part of the Papacy against them? shall, then, the English Parliament be made to become a chamber of the Vatican, and issue edicts and Protestant bulls against their efforts in behalf of the British Monarchy, by giving increased energies to Maynooth, and thus stifle loyalty instead of quelling sedition, and reward faction instead of suppressing it?

The *higher* classes among the laity will, no doubt, always enjoy the benefit of the salutary influences of liberal education and polished society; and thus in their case the agency of the system we have described will in a degree be neutralized. But this is not the case with those who have special claims on the guidance and guardianship of the State,—I mean the *poor* and *illiterate*. To them their Priest is every thing; and when we remember the tremendous powers that are wielded by the Roman Catholic Priesthood in the rite of Confession and in Excommunication<sup>1</sup>, the question of the character and tendency of their education becomes one of the most momentous importance. And when Maynooth, which has now "*begun to be felt*"<sup>2</sup>, shall be felt more deeply and extensively, is there not the strongest ground to fear that its results will be seen in rural districts, and in densely populated towns, in the outbreak of such a spirit of anarchy and outrage, as the power which has fostered and strengthened it will attempt too late and in vain to repress?

<sup>1</sup> Appendix, Note FF.

<sup>2</sup> Note D.

But there is another and different class, of the greatest importance, whose position requires the most attentive consideration. We do not hesitate to call the Protestant population of Ireland the true bulwark of the Throne; and among the institutions of that country, we do not scruple to assign the first place to the Protestant Church. We should take shame to ourselves, if in this, her hour of trial,—if, after her energies have been crippled and her resources diminished, we did not regard her with greater affection and respect, even on account of her sufferings. We feel an animating confidence that trial will add to her real strength; that she may, by God's mercy, recover by the discipline of affliction even more of true power than she has lost by the hand of spoliation: and believing that her constitution is conformable to divine appointment, and her faith pure and uncorrupt, we entertain an intimate persuasion, that if she is true to herself, if she make no compromise of her opinions, and stand firm in unity, and well-ordered in discipline, that then she will not only stand secure, notwithstanding all the storms which threaten her, but will also serve to maintain firm and unshaken the Protestant Throne of the United Kingdom.

Therefore, entertaining these persuasions, we cannot conceal our sorrow, that while she is struggling not only for her own cause, but for that of the constitution of the country, she is called upon to be a witness of the honour and encouragement

proposed to be paid to another and adverse community ; and that almost at the same time when her own resources have been *impaired*, she should hear of designs for the *augmentation* of theirs ; and that this proposal should come from *England*, to whom she naturally looks for sympathy and support in her trials, and for whose interests and integrity she is contending with enemies, whose strength, especially when derived from such a quarter, will be her weakness, and whose exaltation will be her abasement.

Still, the evil is not yet inflicted ; and we cannot permit ourselves to doubt, that when the whole subject is fully before the eyes of the British nation, and has been examined in all its bearings by the deliberative wisdom of the British Parliament, such measures will be adopted as public justice requires, and as are most conducive to the maintenance of the safety and dignity of the Crown, and of the peace and honour of the Country. The very question itself cannot but suggest warnings of the most impressive character. Maynooth was founded in 1795, and three years after its establishment, Ireland was in a state of rebellion, and a hostile fleet from France was in its harbours. And, alas ! we have from their own pens a record of the expressions which the disturbances of the country elicited from the first functionaries of Maynooth, at that and a subsequent period. We have the pastoral letters addressed to the people of Ireland by its first Pre-

sident, Dr. Hussey, and by one of its first Trustees, Dr. Doyle<sup>1</sup>; and from them we learn what support the Monarchy derived, in times of danger and difficulty, from the spirit which organized and directed that Institution.

And if it be still true, as Dr. Hussey there assures us, that the “Roman Catholic faith is suitable to all forms of government; Monarchies or *Republics*, Aristocracies or *Democracies*, are not its concerns;” and if it be true, as Dr. Doyle, at a later date<sup>1</sup>, declares, that “*the Minister of England cannot look to the exertions of the Catholic Priesthood*; for that this Clergy are not, as *formerly*, brought up under a despotic government, and that, if a *Rebellion were raging* from Carrickfergus to Cape Clear, no sentence of excommunication would ever be fulminated by a Catholic Prelate, or, if fulminated, it would fall, as Grattan once said of *British Supremacy*, like a spent thunderbolt;” if the same person addressed as his “dear brethren,” and “wished them peace and benediction,” who, as he himself says, were ‘forming a dark and bloody conspiracy’ at the time of their sovereign’s visit to Ireland<sup>2</sup>; we cannot, if we give additional strength to an institution framed and governed under such auspices as those of the writers of the above words, look with any feeling of satisfaction to the issue, if, three years after such *augmentation*, events should occur similar to those which took place in Ireland three years after its *foundation*.

<sup>1</sup> Appendix, Note Z. and AA.

<sup>2</sup> Note Z.



These may be said to be vain alarms : but let us remember that, in all human probability, the peace of France and of Europe depends on the life of one man ; let us call to mind the national bitterness towards England, which displayed itself on a recent occasion (on the affair of Tahiti) in that country, in a degree almost incredible to those who had not ocular demonstration of it ; let us bear in mind that in addition to this antipathy there is a very strong religious feeling in France in favour of the predominance of the *Papal* interest, as opposed to the *Monarchical*, in Ireland, and that if the revolutionary spirit be again let loose in France, the religion of Rome, which, as we are told by Dr. Hussey, is “suited to a Democracy as well as a Monarchy,” would find no difficulty in allying itself with it. In addition to this, let us not forget that there is in the Romanism of *Ireland* a lurking hope (which operated strongly at the time of the French invasion in 1798<sup>1</sup>) of occupation of rights and property, which it declares to be its own, and to have been unjustly wrested from it, and that it does not scruple to teach that Ireland is the feudal possession<sup>2</sup> of its own spiritual head, and that the Professors of Maynooth countenance that doctrine<sup>3</sup>; and

<sup>1</sup> Appendix, Note BB.

<sup>2</sup> Appendix, Note P.

<sup>3</sup> “Even with respect to England,” Maynooth Report, p. 190, 191, Dr. Slevin (Prefect of the Dunboyne Establishment at Maynooth) says, “I have shown that the Holy See claimed a temporal right to the English Crown.”—Paul IV., in 1568,

that whatever may be its opinion of the value of this assertion, the claim may be always drawn into a plea for non-allegiance to the English Crown; let us not forget the language it is sometimes heard to use with regard to the property and lives of *heretics*<sup>1</sup>; let us, I say, reflect on these things as they deserve that we should do, and, in examining the expediency of increasing the resources of Maynooth, we shall probably see other weighty *external* reasons for caution and apprehension, besides those derived from the imminent danger of injury to the institutions of the country, and of social and domestic confusion and misery arising from *within*.

Having referred to a neighbouring country in these pages, let me now close them with two remarks relative to *it*, as compared with *ourselves*. If *France* has sometimes been productive of *injury* to us, it may also, in turn, prove of *great service*, if we are but willing to profit by the salutary instruction and warning to be derived from its example.

In speaking of the Gallican Articles of 1682, which were framed and published for the maintenance of the independence and just rights of the Crown of France, I have already observed that notwithstanding the precautions taken by the State

conceived he had this right: it is a reasonable conjecture that Pius V., in 1569, may have conceived the same. Dr. Slevin explains the Papal attempt to depose Queen Elizabeth on this principle.

<sup>1</sup> In Maynooth Text-Book : Appendix, Note CC.

to secure the inviolability of these propositions, they are now almost universally regarded with indifference and antipathy by the French Church, and that the character of its clergy has become ultramontane, and that the temporal power cannot rely on the support of that part of the community which ought to be its most faithful and zealous auxiliary; and that the civil and ecclesiastical authorities are at direct variance with each other, as is but too evident from the unhappy controversy now prevalent in that country with respect to national education.

Let me, therefore, ask the following questions:— Is, then, the *Protestant* Government of England prepared to adopt as its allies those who *begin* with rejecting the Gallican Articles? Does it expect to find devoted supporters of the Crown among *their* ranks? Is it willing to disparage, to scorn, to abandon, and to reject the loyal, zealous, and steady support of the Protestant Church of the United Kingdom, and to lavish its favours on those who plainly declare, by their teaching and their practice, that they regard the principles of the Church of France as derogatory to the just rights of the Papal See and as *too favourable* to the Crown? Are they disposed to expect from *them* that devotion to a *Protestant* Monarchy, which the French Clergy, whose corporate acts are reprobated as too loyal at Maynooth, do not afford to a *Roman Catholic* throne?

The second inquiry is this. We have seen, on unquestionable evidence, that *Jesuitical* influence

(the most ultramontane of all ultramontane influences) has introduced itself, nay, has been studiously sought for, and zealously welcomed, and cordially entertained, and conspicuously honoured, by the President of the Royal College of Maynooth, the titular Archbishop of Dublin; that the whole government of that seminary has been committed at certain seasons to Jesuitical hands; that no statutes, no oaths of allegiance, have been of force enough to exclude from the Chair of Authority and of Teaching the Head of the Jesuits of Ireland. These facts, we say, are now in evidence on oath before Parliament; they are before the eyes of the world. Such are the public acts of Maynooth.

Now, I will not multiply demonstrations of the just fears which *every Government* in Europe has entertained with regard to the Members of that Order; I will not cite the expressions of *censure* and of *condemnation*, not of *honour* and *reward*, with which these Governments have visited those who have harboured them; nor need I recount, that in 1755 the Jesuits were proscribed in Spain; in 1759, were banished from Portugal; that, in 1767, they were expelled from Naples, and from the two Sicilies, and in the following year from Parma and Placentia; nor that the Order was suppressed by a Pope himself, Clement XIV., at the urgent demand of Sovereign Princes, in 1773, but again revived by Pius VII.<sup>1</sup>, in

<sup>1</sup> Bull of Pius VII., Aug. 1814. Foreign Report, p. 426.



1814, as the most powerful ally of the Papacy, and that "all their Colleges and Houses, and all who should join them are now," such are that Pope's words, "under the especial tutelage of the See of Rome."

I will not dwell on these things, but content myself with reference to France. In 1610, the year of the murder of Henry IV., their books were burnt at Paris by order of *Parliament*. In 1644 the *University* of Paris, in its Petition to Parliament, affirmed that the pernicious doctrines "of the Jesuits affected the security of all states, and the repose of all nations interested in the preservation of the authority and just power, and of the life of their kings and princes ; in which doctrines," adds the University, "the Jesuits declare they are all united<sup>1</sup>." In the year 1682 the *Church* of France, headed by Bossuet, drew up its four Articles specially directed against them. In 1763 the *Parliament* of Paris declared, by its decree of the 6th of August, that "the Order of Jesuits was by its nature inadmissible in all rightly constituted states, as being contrary to natural rights, subversive of all authority, and tending to introduce in Churches and States, under religious pretexts, a political Society, whose essence consists in incessant exertions to arrive by every means, direct or indirect, secret or public, first, at an absolute independence, and subsequently, at the usurpation of all authority." Where-

<sup>1</sup> Fleury, Discours, p. 82. Ibid. 406.

upon the Order of Jesuits was suppressed in France, and is so at this day.

Such, then, is the language of the *University*, the *Church*, and the *Parliament* of Roman Catholic *France*, concerning the tendency of Jesuitical influence even in that country.

Looking, therefore, first at their example, and then at the evidence before us, with respect to Maynooth (a *Royal* College, be it remembered, maintained by *national* bounty); looking at the *abuses* to which its endowments have been perverted—and there is no reason to expect that, when *greater power* is given it, these *abuses* will become *less*—we do not hesitate to say, calmly and respectfully, that the first duty of the British Nation, and of the British Government, is to require it to render an account of the manner in which it has employed its revenues, administered its trusts, and discharged its functions.

This is a duty which the Nation and the Government owe to the British Crown, which is the Founder of Maynooth, and whose rights are endangered by it: it is a duty which they owe to the Church, and to every College in the Empire, whose honour is compromised by the praise and reward proffered to Maynooth; it is a duty which they owe to Maynooth itself, that these facts which we have stated concerning it, from evidence given by the officers of that College upon oath, should be refuted if they are not true. And if they *be true*, then it follows, as a necessary consequence, that the

responsible Authorities of that College should be summoned before Parliament for merited public censure, and not for fresh national encouragement.

This is the *preliminary* step to be taken; this is the duty which the very mention of the name of Maynooth in the ears of the British Public imperatively requires; and until that step is taken, any question with regard to *additional* confidence to be reposed in that College, and any *new* endowments to be conferred on it by the country, ought, we affirm, to remain in abeyance.

Yes; and yet further still, before we make *new laws* concerning Maynooth, let us recur to *old ones* with respect to it. They are not of very ancient date. Let us not patronize in 1845 those whom we banished in 1829. Let us put our own acts in force. The exigences of the State demand it. As the Government values the safety and honour of the Crown, and regards the peace and welfare of the Country, and loves the life of the Sovereign, let it refer to the clauses of the Roman Catholic Emancipation Bill<sup>1</sup> of 1829 concerning Religious Orders, and in compliance with them let it require every Jesuit, who was in England before that date, *to be registered*; and let it see that its own sentence is carried into effect with regard to those of that Order who have come into these kingdoms, or who have taken the vows of Jesuits since that period.

<sup>1</sup> 10 Geo. IV. c. 7.

Until these things have taken place, all other propositions with respect to Maynooth are *premature*.

And, to sum up all, we humbly submit that this is a duty which the *Government owes to itself*,—(and it is also the duty of all well-wishers to it not to disguise from it this fact, not, I say, to murmur in secret against it, nor to sit in sullen silence, but to speak in plain words such as it becomes Englishmen to use,)—if, with these stains still remaining on the name of Maynooth, the Government looks for support from the great Institutions and Communities of the country, or indeed from any other quarter but from Maynooth alone; and we have just seen *what kind of support* it is likely to derive from *thence*. For the principles which Maynooth teaches, which were condemned, as we have shown, by the unanimous voice of the *Crown*, the *Parliament*, the *Church*, and the *University of Roman Catholic France*, as tending to aggrandize the Papacy, and as subversive of the rights of the Throne, and destructive of the peace of the Country, can never, we firmly believe, receive honour and encouragement from the *Crown*, the *Parliament*, the *Church*, or the *Universities of Protestant Britain*<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Since the above was written and printed, I find that a similar view of the case, in many respects, has been taken in the *Quarterly Review*, in the year 1841; and I beg to corroborate what is said above by reference to that authority:—

QUARTERLY REVIEW for March, 1841, p. 548.—“The *Jesuits*, through the first Principal, Dr. Hussey, Dr. Troy, Father Betagh, Dr. Murray, and Mr. Kenney, soon procured access to *Maynooth*; and that it by degrees passed into their hands, or under their



influence, can no longer be doubted. What connexion exists between *Maynooth* and *Clongowes* will be well worth the attention of the Legislature."

*Ibid.* p. 555.—"It is well known that, among other means of working on the mind, the *Jesuits* lay much stress on the practice (invented by themselves) of *Retreats*. . . . These '*Retreats*,' to which they attach '*a value inferior only to the Gospel*,' have within the last few years been extended to the *Parochial Priests*, and the management of them has been committed by several of the Romish Bishops to the *Jesuits*. Not two years ago, in one of the principal monasteries of Ireland, were the *whole body of Priests in two dioceses* received for one week, and their coadjutors for the next, and did Dr. *Kenney*, the *Head of the Jesuits*, come down for the express purpose of superintending their spiritual exercises? When it is understood that these *Retreats* include not only direct *instruction* from the Superintendents, but a *Confession*, and that the *books* used are written by *Jesuits*, it will not be thought strange that the influence exercised by the *Jesuits upon the pupils at Maynooth* should *extend* over them when established (as *Priests*) in their *Parishes*."

*Ibid.* December, 1840, p. 152.—"The following questions are propounded for the attention of the Government:—'Have the *Jesuits* been registered, as the Emancipation Bill prescribed? What is the number of their houses and schools? Have they effected a lodgment in Ireland, especially under the name of *Christian Brothers*, the *Sodalities of the Heart*, *Brethren of the Faith* or *Doctrine*? Are these spreading rapidly? Are Children in National Schools initiated in these *Sodalities*?' (page 534).—'What influence procured the brief from the Pope for establishing the Order (of *Christian Brothers*) in Ireland? Was it Dr. *Kenney*, the present *Jesuit Head of Clongowes*?—Did they vainly endeavour to shake off the yoke till they at last succumbed, and have ever since been held in the hands of the *Jesuits*, the General of the *Jesuits* moving Dr. *Kenney*, Dr. *Kenney* commanding the Superior of the Order, the Superior nominating the Directors, and all the *Brethren* being bound to yield to them the

most implicit obedience? How is their profession of vows to be reconciled with the *Emancipation Act*, which prohibited every thing of the kind under penalty of banishment for life?'' (page 586.)

## APPENDIX.

---

### NOTE A.

Archbishop MAGEE. (Lords, p. 780.)

“It is the misfortune of the present day that the Roman Catholics have made now their religion their politics; and if the consequence of my having a very unfavourable opinion of their system of religion be, that I must be supposed to be adverse to their political claims,—I cannot help that, it is their act, not mine.

“As long as I find that the Roman Catholic system still avowed in that Church, and in no one part disclaimed by any authority of that Church, is such as to be in its obvious consequences at war with the peace and safety of society, so long is it impossible for me to desire to give the members of that communion increased power.

“I feel that if power be given to those who acknowledge as a vital principle a spiritual supremacy, power is actually given to the person who possesses that spiritual supremacy, and therefore we let into our constitution a *foreign* influence of a much more dangerous character than if it were avowedly *temporal* . . . This supremacy, from its nature and character, must necessarily (as the next world will be felt by every conscientious man to be more important than the present) be paramount over that which the loyal Protestant subjects of this realm consider to be supreme.

“Here is the great difficulty with respect to Roman Catholics. There is scarcely any other description of religionists in existence that may not be admitted into offices in the state without introducing a new power . . . But *they* hold these offices cheap, compared with that allegiance which in any state is dangerous—a *foreign* allegiance, but which in the Protestant state of Britain is eminently dangerous.”

“Does your Grace think Ireland can remain quiet after all which has passed, supposing the claims of the Roman Catholics to be continued to be refused?”

"I look upon that as not the principal consideration. The government, as I conceive, is to remain unmoved in its true and just position, whatever temporary disquiet may be the result of its deliberate act. And I very much fear that any appearance of desire on the part of the government to yield, through the apprehension of disturbance that may grow out of the refusal of the Roman Catholic claims, will secure perpetual disquiet to that government. I have no notion of a government which is not a firm one."

"Does your Grace apprehend no danger from withholding of the claims?"

"I do not feel myself at liberty to enter into calculations upon such a subject. . . . I am afraid to let a notion of expediency rise in my mind, against what I feel to be a question of duty. I never can reconcile myself to a positive and (as I conceive) a permanent evil, on the chance of a speculative and temporary good."

#### NOTE B.

Archbishop MAGEE. (House of Lords, May 15, 1825.)

"I think the description of Roman Catholic Clergy, in former times, from a foreign education, is superior to that produced by the domestic education of Maynooth. The impression upon my mind, with respect to the Roman Catholic Clergy of former days, was certainly much more favourable than it has been with respect to those who have been educated at Maynooth. In Maynooth the Student breathes the atmosphere, if I may so say, of inflammation. The instruction which they receive in that place is, as I understand, of a species much inferior to what might be received in the foreign Universities, and their learning is, as I apprehend, principally conversant about that very system which seems to present the chief obstacles to the safe admission of Roman Catholics to the civil power in a Protestant State.

"But still more injuriously do they (the influences of the place) tend to elevate him (the future Priest) in his comparison of himself with the professors of every other Christian denomination, whom he is taught by this system to consider but as the growth of yesterday, as having no share in the privileges of what he calls the Church, and who, in not acknowledging the authority of that Church, are to be viewed as rebels, and deserters from its jurisdiction. All this the books, which are their constant study, daily inculcate, and this they here learn to be their duty afterwards to teach and inculcate upon others."



## NOTE C.

Daniel O'CONNELL, Esq. (Commons, March 4, 1825.)

"The Priests, who were educated in France, had a natural abhorrence of the French Revolution, which bore so much on the Catholic Clergy. They were very strong Anti-Jacobins, if I may use the expression. By that means there was among them a great deal of what is called ultra-royalism; but, with the Priests educated at Maynooth, the Anti-Jacobin feeling is gone by, and they are more identified with the people, and therefore in the phrase that is usually called loyalty, they do not come so much within the description of it as the Priests educated in France."

## NOTE D.

The Rev. Mortimer O'SULLIVAN. (Commons, April 26, 1825.)

"I believe the system of Maynooth to be of a more intolerant nature than the system adopted on the Continent. The Students of Maynooth do not mingle in general intercourse so much as they would if they had been on the Continent, where it is probable, also, that the affairs of Ireland were thought of so little as that there was nothing to keep alive political rancour in the mind. Those who were formerly educated on the Continent were, I believe, better educated Priests than those we see now.

"I believe it required a greater command of pecuniary resources, formerly, to educate a Priest. Roman Catholics have regretted to me, very much, the state of education at Maynooth."

Mr. INGLIS. (Tour in Ireland, in 1834, p. 392, *fifth edition*.)

"I had ample opportunity of forming comparisons between the priests of the olden time and the priests of Maynooth.

"I entertain no doubt that the disorders which originate in hatred of Protestantism, have been increased by the Maynooth education of the Catholic Priesthood. It is the Maynooth Priest who is the agitating Priest; and if the foreign-educated Priest happen to be less a hater of Protestantism than is consistent with the present spirit of Catholicism in Ireland, straightway an assistant from Maynooth is appointed to the parish. In no country in Europe, no not even in Spain, is the spirit of Popery so intensely anti-Protestant as in Ireland. I do believe at this moment that Catholic Ireland is more ripe for the re-establishment of the Inquisition, than any country in Europe."

It is well known that Mr. Inglis was a Whig.

QUARTERLY REVIEW, 1841, vol. lxvii. p. 548.

"This sudden alteration of sentiment (concerning the right of veto

in the Crown on the appointment of Roman Catholic Bishops in Ireland) is in itself remarkable, and it might be interesting to enquire if any of the parties who were employed in rousing the popular feeling against the *veto* were connected either directly or indirectly with any secret influence from another quarter. It is equally remarkable, but less inexplicable, if we turn to some other changes which had during that time taken place in the Irish Priesthood. ‘*Maynooth*,’ says Mr. Wyse<sup>1</sup>, ‘*began to be felt*.’ Maynooth the curse of Ireland (and when will Englishmen learn that nothing but a curse can spring from an abandonment of principle?). This College, which is allowed on all hands to be the seat and fountain-head of the mischief, was founded in 1795, under ‘An Act for the better education of persons professing the Papist or Roman Catholic religion.’ Its real object was to take Romish Priests out of the hands of *foreign influence*. Its profession was to give them a better education, as if it were possible for any religion, least of all for Popery, to allow of so-called heretical interference with the education of its Priesthood.”

See also QUARTERLY REVIEW, vol. lxvii. p. 150, and *passim*.

#### NOTE E.

Cases of *Russia*, *Prussia*, *Sweden*, and *Denmark*.—REPORT, p. 37.

“The Court of Rome has no influence upon the jurisdiction of the Roman Catholic Churches of *Russia*; the only act is to grant the bulls of Confirmation of the Bishops, who are nominated by the Emperor. . . . Those Bishops, so appointed, can receive no mandates from Rome, nor publish any bull, without the permission of the Sovereign, under the severest penalties.”—(See further, *ibid.* pp. 399—428.)

*Prussia*.—(REPORT, p. 40.)

“The appointment of Bishops is, generally, in the Crown: wherever the appointment is not so reserved, the Chapter elects.

“The Minister of the Crown ‘names the Priests to the vacant Churches.’

“No bull, &c. can be published without being submitted to, and approved by, the Government.”

“No communication between Bishops or individuals with the Court of Rome can take place, lawfully, unless through the medium of the Government.” *Ibid.* p. 43.

*Sweden*, p. 39.

“In 1816, there was one Vicar Apostolic in Sweden, with permission of the Government; with no salary from the State.”

<sup>1</sup> Sketch of Catholic Association, i. p. 203.

*Denmark*, p. 38.

“ It does not appear that any Roman Catholic Ecclesiastic, of the Episcopal order, is recognized to exist in Denmark.”

Report on Regulation of Roman Catholic subjects in foreign countries, p. 7.

“ The *Austrian* Bishops are nominated by the Emperor. . . . It is enjoined by the Austrian Law, that at the consecration of a Bishop the Episcopal Oath shall be neither given nor taken in any other than its original sense of a mere canonical obedience to the Pope,” (as in *Spain*, see *ibid.* p. 312,) “ and the Oath of Allegiance to the Crown is *first* taken” (see *ibid.* p. 96).

“ All bulls and briefs of indulgences to be transmitted through the court to obtain the imperial *Placet* (see *ibid.* p. 120—126).”

No appeals to Rome permitted.

An appeal to the Sovereign against any abuse of Ecclesiastical power.

Bulls already admitted have force of law only as long as nothing is presented to the contrary by any more recent enactment of the State.

See further, *ibid.* p. 72.

Similar laws of the civil power will be seen to be in force in Tuscany, Naples, Spain, and *France* (see the REPORT, p. 3—31).

#### NOTE F.

The Gallican articles promulgated by the assembly of French Bishops in 1682, affirm—

1. Que Saint Pierre et ses successeurs n'ont reçu d'autorité de Dieu que sur les choses spirituelles, et non point sur les choses temporelles et civiles . . . les Rois et les Princes, quant au temporel, ne sont soumis par l'ordre de Dieu à aucune Puissance Ecclésiastique.

2. Que les décrets du Saint Concile Œcumenique de Constance, contenus dans ses Sessions 4 et 5, demeurent dans leur force et vertu. (Sess. 4. *Ipsa Synodus*, generale concilium faciens, Potestatem a Christo immediate habet cui quilibet cujuscunque statûs etiam *papalis* existat, *obedire* tenetur in his quæ pertinent ad *fidem*. Sess. 5. Quicunque, cujuscunque statûs etiamsi *papalis*, qui mandatis hujus sacræ synodi et cujuscunque alterius generalis Concilii legitimè congregati *obedire* contumaciter contempserit, nisi resipuerit, condignæ pœnitentiæ subijciatur et debite puniatur.)

3. Qu'il faut régler l'usage de l'autorité apostolique par les canons faits par l'Esprit de Dieu.

4. Que, quoique le Pape ait la principale part dans les questions de foi, son jugement n'est pas irréfornable si le consentement de l'Eglise n'intervienne.

These articles will be found, with a copious comment upon them, in FLEURY'S *Discours sur les Libertés de l'Eglise Gallicane*, p. 37, ed. 1765.

The concordat of 1801, between Napoleon and Pius VII., and the *Loi Organique* of the same year, will be found in DUPIN'S *Manuel du Droit Public Ecclésiastique Français*. Paris, 1844. See also REPORT, p. 279—298.

It is declared by these, that the nomination to Bishoprics is in the Crown: the Bishops nominate the Parochial Clergy (*leur choix ne pourra tomber que sur des personnes agréées par le gouvernement*). No bull, brief, &c., even though it relate to individuals only, to be received, published, or printed, from the Court of Rome without the authorization of government: all who teach in the Ecclesiastical seminaries are to subscribe, the Gallican Liberties. No individual calling himself Legate, Vicar Apostolic or Commissary, can exercise any function relative to the affairs of the Gallican Church, either in France or elsewhere, without the authorization of the Government.

Concerning the Brazils, see the communication of Viscount STRANGFORD, REPORT, p. 385.

#### NOTE G.

Rev. William PHELAN. (Commons, p. 492.)

"It is, or rather *was*, a doctrine of the Gallican Church, that a General Council is above the Pope; but I have no authority (and I have looked anxiously for it) which can lead me to believe that the Irish Roman Catholic Bishops have adopted the decisions of the Gallican Church. On the contrary, I have what I consider very decisive evidence that they do not receive the four propositions commonly called the Gallican Liberties.

"I will refer to a pamphlet of Dr. Milner, in 1808 or 1809: 'There is not (he says) a single Prelate in England or Ireland who is not firmly resolved to *reject* the four articles of the Gallican Church, commonly called the *Gallican Liberties*.'

(See below, Note EE.)

#### NOTE H.

Dr. DOYLE. (Commons, p. 180.)

"If temporalities were attached to Roman Catholic Sees, and to Roman Catholic Parishes in Ireland, would it be inconsistent with the doctrine or discipline of the Roman Catholic Church to admit any interference on the part of the Protestant Sovereign of this country in the appointments?"

"It would be inconsistent with the discipline of the Roman Catholic Church to admit, in such cases, the interference of a Protestant Sovereign in such appointments.



“ I know some arrangements that seem to be of that kind, entered into between the Pope and the Emperor of Russia, and also between the Pope and the King of Prussia, . . . but knowing the state of my own country, and having the religious feelings that I have, though such an arrangement were considered practicable by the Pope, and even wise, I should find it my duty to remonstrate against it.”

## NOTE I.

“ The concession of a *Veto* to the Crown, on the nomination of Roman Catholic Bishops, was approved by the Titular Bishops of Ireland in 1799 and 1808, and by the Pope in 1816, but afterwards withdrawn.” —*Digest*, ii. pp. 210—215. In 1817 Mr. O’CONNELL wrote thus to the Secretary of the Roman Catholic Association : “ You cannot conceive any thing more lively than the abhorrence of those vetoistical plans among the people at large. I really think they will go near to desert all such Clergymen as take an active part in the question.” *Ibid.* vol. i. p. 493. See the conflicting evidence of the same person, *ibid.* p. 496. “ The Board, in 1817, addressed the Bishops on the *Veto*, but the people at large viewed our address with indifference. The attempt of the Board to revive opposition to the *Veto*, in 1817, was totally abortive.”

In 1821 he writes : “ I speak advisedly, that a sanguinary insurrection would immediately have followed its enactment ” (*i. e.* of the Bill claiming the right of *Veto* for the Crown).

## NOTE K.

CARDINAL ERSKINE to SIR JOHN COX HIPPISELEY, Bart., August, 1793.

“ The Bull which is generally named *In Cæna Domini*, because it was published every year on Holy (Maunday) Thursday, until Pope Clement the XIII., out of a compliment to some Princes to whom some parts of the said Bull were obnoxious, left off the publishing it on the said day ; this Bull, although the formality of its publication is now omitted, is, nevertheless, implicitly in vigour in all its extension, and is, likewise, observed in all cases where there is no impediment to the exertion of the Pope’s authority ; therefore it must legally be looked upon as a public declaration to preserve his rights.”

Sir J. C. HIPPISELEY annexes to the above the following words : “ I received this note from Cardinal Erskine at Rome, in the month of August, 1793. He was then in the office of Promotore della Fede, and in a few days after departed on his private mission to England. Soon afterwards he was appointed Auditor of the Pope.”

(From Appendix to Report, &c., p. 341.)

## NOTE L.

The following are the Pope's assertions concerning his own powers, in his own Canon Laws, published by his own *order (jussu)*, from the last complete Edition, S. Reverendi Consistorii Catholici per regnum Saxoniae approbatione, Lipsiæ, 1839, are as follows,—

*On Oaths of Allegiance.*

Decret. II. Pars C. xv. Q. vi. p. 647. "The Apostolic authority altogether cancels illicit Oaths . . . as the Lord says by the Prophet, (Isaiah lviii. 6), Dissolve colligationes impietatis."

"The Roman Pontiff absolves from the Oath of Allegiance, when he *deposes* any from their dignity."

*Oaths of Subjects and Soldiers. (ibid. p. 648.)*

"The Pontifical authority absolves from the oath of allegiance." (The following ancient precedent is then cited,) "The Roman Pontiff, Zachariah<sup>1</sup>, *deposed* the king of the Franks, not so much for his evil deeds, as because he was not serviceable to his own power, and raised to the throne, in his place, Pepin, the father of Charlemagne, and absolved all the Franks from the oath of allegiance, which they had taken.

"The same is done frequently (*auctoritate frequenti*) by the Holy Church, when it releases *soldiers* from the obligation of their oaths."

*Oaths of allegiance to excommunicate persons. (ibid. p. 648.)*

"No one owes allegiance to any excommunicate persons, before they are reconciled to the Holy See. The Pope proceeds to *forbid* such allegiance to be paid." *ibid.* "Juratos milites ne ipsi, quamdiu excommunicatus fuerit, serviant, *prohibeto*."

"No oaths are to be kept if they are against the interest of the Church of Rome."

Decret. Greg. IX. Lib. ii. Tit. xxiv. cap. 27. (vol. ii. p. 358.)

"Oaths which are against the interests of the Church, are not to be called Oaths, but perjuries."

*Ibid.* cap. xxii. p. 355.

"If an Oath which is properly *due* to *one* authority, is taken to another, the obedience due to the former is not affected thereby."

The Pope orders, "Si præstitum juramentum ei, quod a te nobis tanquam debitum est præstandum, *contrarium* reputes, illud illicitum judicabis." *ibid.* p. 355.

*Ibid.* p. 352.

"If an oath has been extorted by *fear*, the Church of Rome is

<sup>1</sup> Pope Zachariah died A. D. 752, and was canonized.

accustomed to absolve from it (*a juramento solet absolvere*), and those who violate the oath are not guilty of mortal sin." (See below, Note T.)

Oaths of Allegiance taken by *Ecclesiastics* are *illicit* and *void*.

(Decret. Greg. IX. Lib. ii. Tit. xxiv. cap. 30. p. 350.)

"Ecclesiastics not having temporalities from laics, are not bound to take oaths of allegiance to them. Certain laics strive to usurp too much on the Divine right, when they compel Ecclesiastics, receiving no temporalities from them, to take oaths of allegiance; but since, according to the Apostle, (Rom. xiv. 4.) every one stands or falls to *his own Master*, we prohibit such Ecclesiastics from any such violence."

*Ibid.* cap. 31. p. 360. (To Ecclesiastics.)

"We declare that you are not bound by your oath of allegiance to your Prince; but that you may resist freely even your Prince himself, in defence of the rights and honours of the Church, and even of your own private advantage."

"The Kingly power is not superior to the Pontifical, but is subject to it, and is bound to obey it." Decret. Greg. IX. Lib. i. Tit. xxxiii. cap. 6. (vol. ii. p. 190.)

The whole of this chapter is very strong and clear on this subject. It is observable, also, that it is addressed to a crowned head:

"Potuisses prerogativam sacerdotii ex eo potius intelligere quod datum est non regi sed sacerdoti, '*Ecce constitui te super gentes et regna, ut cvellas et dissipas, ædifices ac plantes*' (Jerem. i. 10.) . . . et *Fecit et Deus duo luminaria* (Gen. i. 16); sed illa quæ præest *diebus*, id est *Spiritualibus*, major est, ea verò quæ *noctibus*, id est *carnalibus*, minor; ut quanta est inter solem et lunam, tanta inter Pontifices et Reges differentia cognoscatur."

"We declare, affirm, and define, that submission to the Roman Pontiff is necessary to salvation." (Omni humanæ creaturæ omninò de necessitate salutis.) "Whoever resists this power, resists the ordinance of God." (See this enlarged upon in this chapter.) Extrav. Commun. Lib. i. Tit. viii. vol. ii. p. 1159.

"Heretics and Schismatics are excommunicated; and all who were bound to them are released from their obligations." Decret. Greg. IX. Lib. v. Tit. vii. cap. 16.

In the xvi. Canon of the third Council of Lateran, it is affirmed that those oaths are not to be called oaths, but perjuries rather, which are contrary to the advantage of the Church. DR. DOYLE. (Appendix to Educational Report, p. 794.) "The third Lateran Council is one of the General Councils of the Roman Catholic Church" . . . In

the 27th chapter of that Council it is affirmed, that all who are in any way bound to heretics, should consider themselves absolved from all fidelity and obedience due to them as long as they persist in their iniquity.

Dr. MURRAY admits that the Council of Constance was general, and Roman Catholics profess that they receive without doubt what the Canons of the General Councils declare; and one of the decrees of the Council of Constance is, that "faith is not to be kept with heretics, to the prejudice of the Church." Session 19.

In 1626, Urban VIII. published his bull declaring the Oath of Allegiance proposed by King James I. of England to be unlawful, "as tending to wrest the sceptre of the Universal Church from the hands of the *Vicar of Almighty God*."

At the Coronation of a Pope the Cardinals say, "Receive the tiara, decorated with the triple crown, and know that thou art the Father of Kings and Princes, the Governor of the World, the Vicar on Earth of our Lord Jesus Christ."

#### NOTE M.

Dr. DOYLE. (House of Lords, March 21, 1825.)

"The most approved and authentic summary of the Creed of the Roman Catholic Church will be found in the Decrees of the Council of Trent, and in the Profession of Faith by Pius IV., and in what we call the Roman Catechism, or Catechism of the Council of Trent."

The Creed of Pius IV., annexed to the Decrees of the Council of Trent, (of which the Maynooth Class-book, *De Ecclesia*, p. 454, thus speaks: "Maximo in pretio illud concilium habere debent omnes Clerici cum ratione *dogmatum* sit veluti omnium præcedentium synodorum compendium, et ratione Ecclesiasticæ *disciplinæ* merito dici possit *Manuale Sacerdotum*.") "I vow and swear true obedience to the Roman Pontiff, the successor of St. Peter, and Vicar of Jesus Christ. I unhesitatingly receive and profess all things decreed in the Sacred Canons and General Councils, especially by the Holy Synod of Trent.

. . . This true Catholic faith, out of which is no salvation, I vow and swear to hold firm to my dying hour, and to take care that it be held and taught by all under my care, as far as in me lies."

This oath, which will be found in the editions of the Council of Trent, and in the third part of the Canon Law, (ed. 1839,) p. 111, is to be taken by all Ecclesiastics, regular and secular.



## NOTE N.

OATH of Roman Catholic PRIEST to the POPE. (Lords, p. 419.)

“ I acknowledge the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of Rome as the Mother and Mistress of all Churches ; and I promise and swear true Obedience to the Roman Pontiff, the successor of Peter, and Vicar of Jesus Christ ; and all things defined, delivered, and declared by the Holy Canons and General Councils, and especially by the Council of Trent, I do unhesitatingly receive and confess ; and, likewise, I condemn and reject all things contrary thereto. This is the true faith, out of which is no salvation. I will keep it firmly to my life’s end, and will take care that it be kept by my subjects, and those of whom I may have charge. So help me God and these Holy Gospels.”

“ By the term *Vicar of Christ*, a *regal* as well as sacerdotal power was expressly claimed.” See Digest, ii. 64, and the Bull *Unam Sanctam*, cited by Archbishop MAGEE, *ibid.* p. 67, where the following words occur : “ Thus the prophecy of Jeremiah is verified concerning the Church and the Ecclesiastical Power,—‘ I have set thee this day over nations and kingdoms, to root out and to pull down, to destroy, to throw down, to build and to plant.’ ” (Jerem. i. 10.)

## NOTE O.

Archbishop MAGEE. (Lords, May 3, 1825.)

“ I am not able to explain to myself how the heads of the Roman Catholic Church, under a Protestant King, can consistently preserve the Oath of Allegiance to the Sovereign. I find myself unable to reconcile that most solemn oath, that is taken upon the appointment of a Roman Catholic Bishop, with his allegiance to the Sovereign. It appears to me that there is an obligation as deep as can grow out of the feeling of Christianity at war with the civil obligation.

“ The Roman Catholic Bishop is bound by an Oath of Fidelity and Obedience to the Pope and his successors, that he will assist ‘ in retaining and defending the Roman Papacy and the Royalties of St. Peter against every man ;’ that he will ‘ make it his care to preserve, defend, increase, and promote the Rights, Honours, Privileges, and Authority of the Holy Roman Church, and of the Pope and his successors ;’ that ‘ he will engage in no counsel against the Pope or the said Church ;’ that ‘ if he should come to know of any evil attempted against them, he will prevent it to the utmost of his power, and as soon as possible make it known to the Pope ;’ that ‘ he will observe all his Powers, and cause others to observe all the Rules, Decrees, Ordinances, &c., of the Pope :’ these and the remaining articles of the oath leave me totally at a loss

to discover in what respect there is any deficiency as to the fullest obligation to obedience.

"If the Sovereign of this country were engaged in a war with any state on which the papal rights or the privileges of the Roman Catholic see mainly depended, he (the Bishop) would be bound to act in like manner as in the case in which the Pope was immediately concerned.

"Thus the Bishop seems bound by an oath which interferes directly with his oath of allegiance to his Sovereign, when the interests of his Sovereign and the Pope come into collision. If this disturbing influence exerted on the Bishop, be carried down through the Priest, it must be unnecessary to say, from the close and influential contact into which every officiating Priest is brought with the Roman Catholic population of the country, what the effects must be as to the general loyalty.

"There are two Canons among the acts of the Third Council of Lateran which contain very strong matters. The one is the xvith, the other the xxvith. The xvith pronounces that 'Oaths are not to be esteemed Oaths, but rather Perjuries, which are adverse to the interests of the Church.' The xxvith decrees remission of sins to those who pursue heretics to slavery and destruction.

"I beg leave to lay them before the Committee."

The following is the clause *attached* to the *Bishop's Oath* to the *Pope* :—

"Hæc omnia et singula eo inviolabilius observabo, quo certior sum nihil in illis contineri quod fidelitati meæ erga Serenissimum Magnæ Britanniae et Hiberniae Regem ejusque ad thronum successores debitæ adversari possit."

"I think," says Archbishop MAGEE, (Lords, p. 688,) "this appears an ambiguous form of expression, where a very obvious one presents itself. If the intention were to govern the oath to the Pope by that to the Crown, I can hardly think that such a form of expression would not naturally offer itself . . . It would tend to give more security, certainly more clearness, if to the *Oath of allegiance* (to the *Crown*) were added a clause reciting whatever was the reservation attached to the pontifical oath, and specifying the important matters touching allegiance which the pontifical oath was not to affect."

REV. WM. PHELAN. (Commons, p. 528.)

"With respect to the Roman Catholic Priesthood, I readily believe they are willing to pay the State *all the allegiance* which they *think due to it*. But, *what* the measure of that allegiance is to be, depends *neither* on the declaration of the State, *nor* upon their own natural sense of

what ought to be paid by the subject, *but* (as far as I can apprehend the matter) on the declaration of the Pope.”

“I look upon it, that the Oath which they take to the Sovereign, is both subordinate in its terms to the fealty which they swear to the Pope, and also taken by his permission.”

#### NOTE P.

Ireland regarded by the Court of Rome as a fief of the Holy Sec.  
(DIGEST, ii. p. 33.)

“When Henry VIII. shook off the authority of the Pope, Cramer, Archbishop of Armagh, made a speech to his Suffragans and Clergy, laying a curse on the people whosoever should own his Highness’s Supremacy; saying that the isle, as it is in their Chronicles, *Insula Sacra*, belongs to none but the Bishop of Rome.”

“When Queen Mary came to the throne, the Pope severely reprimanded her for retaining the title of royalty which had been taken by her father.”—p. 32.

“In the reign of Elizabeth, the Pope sent Sanders into Ireland, with the title of Legate, to preach resistance to the Government, on the ground that Ireland was a fief of the Holy Sec.”—p. 33.

See *ibid.* p. 48. Dr. O’Conor says, “Paul IV. menaced to depose Queen Mary, because she dared to assume the title of Queen without his consent. He said that Ireland was, by human and Divine right, the property of the Holy Sec.”

“In 1632, Peter Lombard’s History of Ireland was published at Louvain: this work, while still in MS., had been presented by the author to Pope Clement VIII.; it came out dedicated to the Pontiff, with the Papal *Imprimatur*, &c.; it contains the following:

“‘The kingdom of Ireland is an ancient fief of the Apostolic See: the Irish acknowledge themselves to be subject to it, not only in spirituals, but temporals.’”—p. 34.

Lombard was Titular Archbishop of Armagh, and domestic Chaplain to the Pope.

“The same statements were repeated in Porter’s *Ecclesiastical Annals of Ireland*, printed at the Pope’s press, permissu Superiorum, in 1690; and in Father A. O’Brodin’s *Descriptio Hiberniæ*, printed at the same press in 1721; and the *Hibernia Dominicana* of the Titular Bishop Burke, in 1762.”—p. 35. “Hence, in Ireland (as is further clear from the Bishops’ and Priests’ Oath) the Pope is a feudal Sovereign; the Roman Catholic Bishops are Peers of his creation; the Priesthood, his subjects; the Laity, his vassals and feudal liegemen; the impugnors of his authority, rebels.”—p. 30. (See further, *ibid.* pp. 22, 24, 48.)

"In Ireland, the Pope appoints the Bishops; the Bishops appoint the Priesthood" (and "also the Curates of each parochial Priest," p. 131); "and the Priesthood sways the multitude."—p. 132.

## NOTE Q.

Dr. DOYLE. (Lords, p. 500.)

"As our rite of *confession* is *known* to the laws, and our doctrines with regard to it" (*i. e.* as to the inviolable secrecy of all things revealed to the Priest in confession) "universally acknowledged to exist in our Church, the oath, which binds us to discover any treason against the State or his Majesty, does not oblige us to reveal any thing with which we might become acquainted in sacramental confession." Further, the Maynooth Class-book, (DE LA HOGUE, De Pœnitentiâ, pp. 292, 293,) "Si Sacerdos a Magistratu *interrogetur* de iis quorum notitiam ex solâ confessione habuit, reponere debet, se *nescire*, imo hoc ipsum *jurare* sine ullo mendacii periculo."

## NOTE R.

Archbishop MAGEE.

"Suppose an intention to put the King to death, it is communicated to the Priest in confession . . . It is, I believe, fully established, that it is a principle of that Church, that even this intention is not to be revealed; that if it be, the character of the Priesthood is forfeited . . . The reason assigned for not acting under the Oath of *Allegiance* in this case is, that secrecy in confession is a principle of the Roman Catholic Church, '*known to the laws*, and universally acknowledged.' . . . Under the assumption that all the tenets and principles of Roman Catholics are fully known, some that are not consistent with the laws, and with the allegiance of the subject, may be suffered to work without counter-action."

In accordance with this statement of the Archbishop of Dublin, the Bishop of LLANDAFF (in his speech in the House of Lords, May 17, 1825,) said, "I have always imagined that the Roman Catholic nobility and gentry satisfied their minds by some such *constructive* interpretation as that which Dr. Doyle has avowed with respect to the secrecy of confession.

"I have conceived they might reason thus:—The State *knows* our obligations to the Pope; it *knows* we owe him obedience, *implicit* obedience on certain points; it *knows* that we regard this as an obligation *paramount* to all others; and, therefore, it cannot accuse us of *mental* or *secret* reservation in taking the Oath under such a restriction.



... If the legislature thinks fit to accept these our *conditional* protestations and fidelity and submission, there can be no misunderstanding on either side."

## NOTE S.

Dr. MURRAY, President of the Royal College, Maynooth, to William GREGORY, Esq., Maynooth, April 23, 1813.

"No. I. contains, as required by the order of the House of Commons, of the 13th instant, copies of the dogmatical and moral Treatises taught in the Royal College of St. Patrick, Maynooth, during the last year. These Treatises are—

1. De la Hogue's Tractatus de Sacramentis.
2. The following Moral Treatises extracted from the works of the Rev. P. G. Antoine: De Legibus, De Justitia, De Contractibus.

"No. II. contains the remaining Treatises of Dr. De la Hogue.

1. Tractatus De Religione.
2. Tractatus De Ecclesia.

"I think it my duty to add, for the information of the House of Commons, that there are now in the press, for the use also of the College, the following Theological works:—

1. Tractatus De Pœnitentia, auctore L. Æ. De la Hogue.
2. Commentarii totius Sacræ Scripturæ, Joan. Steph. Menochii.
3. Theologia Moralis, auctore Lud. Bailly."

(From Appendix to Foreign Report, &c. p. 541.)

See also Maynooth Report, p. 449.

## NOTE T.

## Dispensation from Oaths.

BAILLY, de Præceptis Decalogi, p. 140. (Maynooth Class-Book.)

"Existit in Ecclesiâ potestas dispensandi in Votis et Juramentis." This power it endeavours to prove from St. Matthew xviii. 18, "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."

Dr. M'HALE (Irish Education Report, Appendix viii. p. 283,) being asked,

"Do you attach that meaning to the word *solveritis* that is attributed to it in this passage?" replies

"Yes. I think it may be susceptible of the meaning of *dispensing from Oaths*."

"We find it laid down in page 145 of that Class-Book, that the following are just causes of dispensation, viz.—

1. The Honour of God.

2. The Utility of the Church.
3. The common good of the Republic.
4. The common good of Society.

Who is to be the judge of what the utility of the Church may require ?”

“ The Superiors of the Church.”

#### NOTE U.

The Rev. T. W. DIXON, sworn and examined 25th October, 1826.  
(Maynooth Report, p. 322.)

“ Was it generally supposed at Maynooth that Mr. Kenney, the Vice-president, was a professed Jesuit ?”—“ Certainly we believed him to be a Jesuit, and that he was at the head of that establishment at Clongowes, which was then in active preparation.”

“ Did he wear the Jesuits’ dress at that time ?”—“ No.”

“ In point of fact, did the Jesuit order exist at that time ?”—“ We called him a Jesuit.”

“ At the period to which you refer, had the Jesuit order been restored by a Bull of the late Pope ?”—“ The late Pope, I believe, restored the Jesuits after his return from captivity ; I am not confident about dates, but this I am persuaded of, that we called him a Jesuit.”

“ Did you like him the better or the worse for being a Jesuit ?”—“ We thought a Jesuit was a very fine thing ; a most holy character ; and we considered him a very talented, clever man, and had much respect for him as such.”

“ May not the Jesuits have had a physical existence at a time when they had not a Papal recognition ?”—“ Certainly.”

“ Are the Jesuits generally approved of by the Roman Catholic Bishops ?”—“ In Ireland they seem to be.”

“ In England are they ?”—“ I do not know much about the feelings of the English Popish Bishops.”

“ From what circumstance do you judge of their being favourites with the Roman Catholic Clergy in Ireland ?”—“ The circumstance of Mr. Kenney’s being Vice-president of Maynooth is a proof of it.”

“ Is not the Commentary on the Scriptures that is selected for the College, Menochius, the production of one of the society ?”—“ It is ; and one of the premiums that were given to me was the work of a Jesuit.”

“ What was it ?”—“ It was the work of a Spaniard, Rodriguez, on Christian Perfection, so that I know that they are held in very great respect and veneration at Maynooth.”

## NOTE V.

OATH of ALLEGIANCE to the Crown. (See DIGEST, vol. ii. pp. 222—228.)

“ In the reign of Queen Elizabeth the Roman Catholic Laity were disposed to take the Oath ; but the Priesthood interfered, and it was not taken.

“ King James I. tendered an Oath of Allegiance to Roman Catholics, but the Pope prohibited them from taking it by two bulls. The Pope, also, granted *Indulgences*, to induce the people not to take the Oath, and it was not taken.

“ In the reigns of Charles I. and Charles II. and Queen Anne, the Pope interfered, in a similar manner, against the express wishes of many of the Roman Catholic nobility and gentry, who were desirous of taking the Oath.

“ In the reign of George II. (1757) the Roman Catholic gentry drew up a declaration of allegiance ; but Rome interfered as before. Again, in 1762, the Roman Catholic gentry came forward with a declaration of fidelity, and a loyal address to the throne ; and testified, in considerable numbers, their disposition to take an Oath of Allegiance. This was submitted to the Pope, who refused to approve it.

“ In 1774, an Act passed enabling Roman Catholics to testify their allegiance ; but the Pope through his Legate issued his prohibition against it. Dr. BUTLER, Titular Archbishop of Cashel, (in his letter to the Cardinal Protector of Ireland, and in his Memorial to the Congregation de Propagandâ,) expostulated with the Court of Rome. expressing his regret that ‘ the Oath proposed by Parliament had been severely censured by His Holiness our Lord, and by the Sacred Congregation ; and he and his brother Bishops came forward in support of their tottering Religion, and for the support of their faithful people,’ and ‘ prostrate at the feet of our most holy father, as most entirely united to the Chair of Peter, and ready to shed their life’s blood for it,’ as ‘ certain that it is not the wish of the Apostolic See that all the Catholics of this kingdom should expose themselves to the hatred and suspicion of the Protestants, and the cruel force of the Calvinists, on account of certain probable doctrines, which, however strong may be the foundations on which they rest, are unsuited to the troubled state and character of this country.’ ‘ The Incomes (says the Bishop) of our Preferments are small, and will daily become smaller, while the laws under which we groan continue in force : these laws have been edged against us by certain doctrines of the Schools, which have been too generally, and with too intemperate zeal, disseminated among us. As the heretics believe that these things are intimately con-

nected with our religion, they therefore turn from us as hostile to the tranquillity of Kings and Subjects.’”

The editors of the *DIGEST*, Vol. ii., p. 76, say, “Until the year 1778, the Popes did not permit the Roman Catholics of these islands to take an oath of civil allegiance to a Protestant Sovereign; and their opposition was grounded partly on a special claim to Ireland as a fief, partly on the general principle that the sovereignty of all Christendom belonged to the Vicars of Jesus Christ. It is equally certain that the oath was not taken until permission came from Rome.”

Mr. *PHELAN* states, (*DIGEST*, ii. p. 228.)

“In the letter of Cardinal *LITTA*, in the name of the Pope, to the English Vicars Apostolic, in 1816, it is said :—‘His Holiness is ready to give his firm consent to the taking of an Oath of Allegiance in the event of Emancipation taking place in such a manner as would be favourable to all classes of Catholics.’”

#### NOTE W.

The Rev. T. W. *DIXON*. (*Ibid.* p. 322.) See above, p. 110.

“What amount of income did you lose by abandoning the Roman Catholic Church?”—“About 300*l.* a-year.”

“What prospect had you of obtaining any, and what income, in lieu of it in the Protestant establishment?”—“None.”

“Had you no sort of expectation of preferment in the Protestant Church?”—“None whatever.”

“Did you become entitled to any annuity, under any law, in consequence of conforming to the Established Church?”—“No.”

“What is the greatest amount of emolument you have ever had in the Protestant Church, since you conformed to it?”—75*l.* a-year, sometimes 80*l.*; when I was doing the duties in England it was more than that.”

“And you voluntarily gave up 300*l.* per annum in the Roman Catholic Church?”—“I did.”

“You must have had some conflict with yourself before you came to that decision?”—“I certainly had; for it is a very hard thing not only to sacrifice personal emolument, but to sacrifice the good-will and friendship of a person’s own family and acquaintance, and to alienate one’s self from one’s family and one’s father’s house.”

“Did you become discountenanced by your family in consequence of taking that step?”—“In a great measure.” . . . .

“When you were at Maynooth, were the students required to take the Oath of Allegiance?”—“Yes, I recollect they were.”



“Did you take the Oath of Allegiance?”—“I did.”

“Did you consider yourself bound by that oath?”—“I considered myself bound by that oath certainly ; but at the same time I considered that I could obtain absolution from the oath, if the *interests of the Church* should require it.”

“The oath itself contains a declaration that you do not hold any such belief ; did you make that declaration, believing it at the time, that is, did you make a false declaration?”—“I was very young at the time I took the oath, and I was very incompetent to the exercise of judgment. There were several at quarter sessions who came to take that oath : the oath and the declaration were read, and we were required to hold the book and kiss it, and, after this ordeal, to make our bow to the chairman and withdraw.”

“How old were you at the time?”—“I am now thirty-three years of age, and I entered the college in the year 1810, so that I was about seventeen years of age at that time.”

“Did you consider the oath when you took it, or during the period during which you afterwards remained in the Roman Catholic Church, a lawful oath ?”—“I considered it a lawful oath under the conditions above stated. Being directed by my superiors at Maynooth to take this oath, I considered it lawful for me to take this oath, in consequence of their order ; but then I considered that *they could absolve me from the obligation* of that oath the next hour, if they chose to do it.”

“What reason had you to suppose that?”—“That was the general impression on my mind, and I am confident that it was an impression that prevailed generally on the minds of those who accompanied me.”

“Have you ever heard any professor of the college of Maynooth at any time, under any circumstances, teach or express an opinion that the Oath of Allegiance taken to His Majesty was an unlawful oath?”—“I do not recollect that I have, because my intercourse with them was very limited—it was confined to the class hours ; but I can state that the general impression upon the minds of the students is, *that it is an oath elicited by circumstances, forced by circumstances, and that a priest, or a bishop, or the Pope can absolve them from the obligations of that oath.*”

“You were a priest in the Roman Catholic Church, and had a cure of souls?”—“I had.”

“You had charge of a parish?”—“I had.”

“Did you inculcate upon your parishioners that it would be lawful for them to break that oath?”—“I do not think I am bound to answer that question.—[*The witness was informed that he would be required by the Commissioners to answer the question.*]—I certainly did not inculcate such principles. I never told the people that they were at liberty to

violate their oaths, but I know that they were fully of opinion, that I could absolve them from the obligations of that oath."

"The question is, whether you taught your parishioners that the Oath of Allegiance taken to His Majesty by Roman Catholics, and which you yourself took, was an unlawful oath?"—"I certainly did not teach them such a thing."

"Would you consider it your duty, as a Roman Catholic Clergyman, to inculcate that principle?"—"I would consider it my duty, as a Roman Catholic Clergyman, to inculcate that principle, if I got such instructions from the bishop, or the Pope, or any superior authority."

"The question is, what you felt it your duty to teach your parishioners?"—"While I was in strict obedience, and in perfect amity with the doctrines and principles of the Church of Rome, I considered the Pope's authority superior to any temporal one, and I considered that disobedience to him was the greatest crime that I could, generally speaking, be guilty of; and I certainly considered that he could absolve me from the obligations of that oath, and that if he required that I should preach to my people that it was necessary for any given reason to violate the obligations of that oath, I should consider it my duty to obey him."

"That was your sincere opinion?"—"That was my opinion then."

"Though you were a clergyman of the Roman Catholic Church, you never asked any prelate of that church to reconcile to you the extraordinary difference between what you expressly swore, and what it appeared to you the Church taught?"—"I was aware that I was obliged to believe the Councils, which enjoined that there was no faith to be kept with heretics, as true and canonical councils, and then of course there is an end of the matter. I was obliged implicitly to submit to the decision of those Councils, without having it in my power to withdraw my mind from that influence."

"Was it ever taught at Maynooth, that according to any Council of the Church, it was lawful to break faith with heretics?"—"We were taught that the Council of *Constance* was a true and Canonical Council I believe."

"You were taught to believe that?"—"Yes."

"Were you acquainted with the decrees of that Council?"—"Yes."

"Is it from the Council of *Constance* you collected the notion that it was lawful to break the Oath of Allegiance that you took?"—"I know that the Council of *Constance* confirmed the Council of *Basil*, and I know that the Council of *Trent* confirmed both."

"The question put to you is, whether you understood that the Council of *Constance* taught that it was lawful to break faith with heretics?"—"I know that it confirmed the decrees of the other council,

and that there was such a connexion and chain, that I considered the Council of Trent to have certainly confirmed that doctrine; and coupling with it the treatment that John Huss received, and the practical illustration of it in the persecutions of the Romish Church, I was firmly persuaded of it."

"State what were the feelings towards the Established Church among the students?"—"That the members of it were heretics, cut off from the possibility of salvation in a future life, unless they repented and became reconciled to the Church of Rome."

"The question has a reference to the Clergy rather than to the Laity, to the constituted Authorities of the Church?"—"We had more animosity against the Protestant Clergy; the Orangemen, and general run of Protestant Laymen, we certainly considered as people that fully deserved our animosity and hatred, but the persons in particular who had robbed us of our possessions, we considered ought to be more peculiarly the objects of our indignation."

"What do you mean by robbing you of your possessions?"—"By possessing the Church Property, which devolved to them subsequently to the Reformation."

"Did you ever hear the question discussed as to the right they have to the Churches they now occupy?"—"Yes, that formed a part of our subject betimes. We thought that they were intruders, and had no right whatever, except by the strong arm of power; we did not consider that they had any spiritual character—that they were neither Bishops nor Priests; we considered them mere Laymen; but that at the same time they were in the possession of our properties."

"What do you mean by your properties?"—"The present Church Property of Ireland, we considered to be the property of the Roman Catholic Church."

"Did you ever discuss at all what was to become of that property, in the event of the separation you have spoken of?"—"Of course the Church was to be reinstated in the possession of it."

"How far did you imbibe all those notions, that you describe yourself as possessing, before you came into the College?"—"It is possible that I might have imbibed the general disposition to them before I came to the College; but when I came to the College, those arrangements used more fully to be canvassed among the students; and I learned more as to their right to the Church Possessions after I came there, and that the Protestants were heretics, and already condemned to eternal torments."

"Did nobody ever suggest, upon the occasion of those discussions, that those notions were a little at variance with the Oaths of Allegiance, which all the persons present must have taken?"—"Possibly; but



we thought that those oaths were required of us, in order to save appearances."

"Was the dispensing power in the Pope ever discussed upon those occasions?"—"Certainly, it was *fully established that the Pope could dispense with the obligations of the oath*; nor were we ignorant that he had actually carried into effect that power by *absolving Queen Elizabeth's subjects in Ireland, and depriving Henry the Eighth of his crown.*"

"At what time were those discussions in the habit of being carried on?"—"When we went out into the fields for recreation, we generally congregated together into groups, and discussed those matters."

"Did none among you take the part of the Protestants, and of the established order of things, upon the occasion of any of those discussions?"—"Certainly not, except for argument sake."

"Do you mean that not a single individual among you seriously took that side?"—"Certainly not."

"Or denied the Dispensing Power?"—"The Dispensing Power we all firmly believed."

"Although the Professor taught the reverse?"—"Although the Professor taught the reverse; because how could the Pope have attempted to have done it, if it was not a matter that was lawful?"

"Did the history that informed you that the Pope attempted to do it, not also inform you that the Roman Catholic Clergy and Laity resisted him?"—"We certainly knew that he was not restrained by the Council of Trent."

#### NOTE X.

Mr. E. MOLONY, late Student of Maynooth, sworn and examined  
November 23, 1826.

"You took the Oath of Allegiance yourself, did you not?"—"I did."

"Did you consider yourself bound by the Oath or not?"—"I conceived myself bound by the Oath, but in fact I was not well acquainted with the articles of the Oath at the time."

"You state that you were unwilling to bind yourself to Allegiance to the British Government?"—"Yes."

"But when you took the Oath, did you not consider that you had bound yourself to Allegiance to the British Government?"—"When I took the Oath I conceived that I bound myself, but I conceived that that Oath might be dispensed with by the dispensing power."

"Do you recollect the Oath that you took?"—"I recollect some parts of it."

"Do you recollect that it contained a distinct clause, in which you



declare, before God, that you do not believe that you can be absolved from the obligation of that engagement by any dispensing power?"—" I do ; and that formed a subject of controversy among the Students ; it made them doubt whether the Pope could absolve them, and whether he had the dispensing power."

" You declared in the Oath, solemnly before God, that you did not believe that the Pope had the dispensing power ; did you make that declaration, believing, at the time, that he had the dispensing power ?"—" Yes, I did ; I believed that the Pope had the dispensing power ; and that was a matter which I found it afterwards impossible to reconcile, and which the other Students found it likewise impossible to reconcile."

" Did you think the Oath binding upon you till you should be absolved from it by the Pope ?"—" Yes, I was persuaded it was binding upon me unless absolved by the Pope, and I believed that the Pope had a dispensing power, and I found it difficult to know how I could swear that. I was not aware of that clause, or what the articles of Allegiance were, before I took them ; it struck all the Students with astonishment how they could believe in the Pope's dispensing power, and yet take that Oath."

" Did you think that the Pope could dispense with the Declaration, as well as the Oath ?"—" I certainly believed that the Pope could dispense with it ; and I recollect that when the matter was controverted and spoken of by the Students, the historical fact of the case of King John was brought forward as a matter, which some used as an argument to prove that the Pope could dispense even with Allegiance, and they wanted to know how they could possibly take that clause in the Oath, which said, that they did not believe the Pope to have the dispensing power ; it came upon the Students suddenly ; when they came to the Court-house they did not know what the articles of the Oath were ; however, they took the articles of the Oath, and I, as an individual, took the Oath at the time, listening to the Declarations, and I thought it very strange."

" Had you any copy of the Oath in the College, or did you hear it for the first time when it was read in Court ?"—" I heard it for the first time there."

" When you heard it for the first time in Court, were you not aware that it was an Oath sanctioned by the College ?"—" Yes, I was aware that it was an Oath sanctioned by the College."

" Did you believe that the College would sanction you in solemnly declaring before God, that you did not believe that the Pope could dispense from that Oath, if, in point of fact, it was the doctrine of the

College that he could dispense from that Oath?"—"The College took no particular pains to inform me what the articles of the Oath were, nor did they advert at all to the fact of the Pope's dispensing power in this Oath; but all the Students were brought out of the College to the Court-house to take the Oath, and I, as an individual, went and took the Oath; but I did believe the Pope to have the dispensing power, and I found it impossible to reconcile the Oath with that."

"Was it within the precincts of the College that you took the Oath of Allegiance?"—"No, in the court-house of the town."

"At the quarter sessions?"—"Yes."

"Who gave you notice to attend at the court-house in order to take the oath?"—"I was a freshman in the College at the time; and as far as I can recollect, I think notice had been given by the monitors that were over us, as freshmen at the time, that we were to go and take the Oath of Allegiance; and I do not know whether it was the night before we took the Oath, or whether it was on the morning of that day."

"Did any one at Maynooth ever explain to you the nature of that Oath before you were taken to the Court-house, in order to subscribe to it?"—"No."

"Did you ever see a copy of it, or did you ever read it previously to your taking it?"—"Not that I recollect."

"How did you make up your own mind before you went to the Sessions-house, as to whether you might safely take that Oath or not?"—"I did not know a single clause in the Oath at the time I was going there."

"How did you make up your mind as to whether you might safely take that Oath or not?"—"I believed at the time that the professors of the College would not have the students take the Oath, unless they deemed it consistent with the Church rules; at the time I did not feel any uneasiness about it as being against my Creed."

"You have a general reliance upon the judgment of the Superiors?"—"Yes."

"When you went into the Court-house of Maynooth, will you describe exactly what passed with respect to your taking the Oath?"—"There was, I think, something like a loft where the students all stood, up, I think, on two sides of the Court-house, and the assistant barrister was in the lower part, and he prefaced the solemnities of the Oath by a kind of compliment to the students, saying that they were not to take the Oath of Allegiance to His Majesty from any distrust that His Majesty had of their loyal principles; and he stated the reason why it was taken. I could not say whether it was because the College was

endowed by Parliament or not, or what was the reason ; but I know he mentioned that it was not from any distrust whatever of their principles that they were called on to take the Oath."

" Had you any opportunity of reading the Oath upon that occasion before it was administered to you ?"—" I was not offered it, nor do I know any student that saw the Oath."

" Did you read it, in point of fact, in the Court-house ?"—" No."

" Was it read to you ?"—" It was read."

" By whom ?"—" By a clerk or by the Barrister ; I could not say which."

" What would have been the consequence to any of those students, if they had declined taking the Oath, when they were standing on the loft ?"—" I cannot tell."

" Can you say whether they would have been permitted to remain at Maynooth ?"—" I cannot tell ; I know that some of them made it a point to go home in the vacation at Christmas, in order to evade the Oath ; and I recollect that some of them said, that by that means they would evade it during their term in the College."

#### NOTE Y.

DE LA HOGUE, *Tractatus De Ecclesia* ; Maynooth Class-Book, p. 511.

" A Protestant, when summoned to the Judgment, will appear with no other protection than his own private judgment, by which he searched the Scriptures and proved all the articles of his faith . . . . Who among the children of the Reformed Churches, thinking upon this, and keeping in mind how easy it is for a man, from the frailty of his nature, to transgress, will not tremble at the sentence which is to be pronounced by a most severe Judge ?

" But how different will be the lot of the Catholic, although, which far be it from him to believe, he may have fallen into error by obeying the decrees of the Church concerning doctrine. If the Supreme Judge questioned him on this subject, could he not confidently reply, ' Lord, if that be error which we have followed, Thou Thyself hast deceived us by Thy so oft-repeated precept to hear the Church as Thee, unless we would have our portion with the heathens . . . . Thou Thyself hast deceived us by Thy Church, called by Paul the Pillar and Ground of Truth ; for she has always exacted of her children an entire assent in heart and mind, menacing against rebels, in Thy Name, an everlasting anathema . . . . We say with confidence, O Lord, if that be error which we have followed, Thou Thyself hast deceived us, and we are excused.' "



Dr. MILNER, End of Religious Controversy, p. 16.

“ Catholics, if properly interrogated, will confess their belief in one comprehensive Article, ‘ I believe whatever the Holy Catholic Church believes and teaches.’ ”

Archbishop MAGEE. (House of Lords, April 29, 1825.)

“ I am satisfied that a great many of the laity of the Roman Catholics do not know the doctrines. There is what is called an *implicit* faith admitted according to the established principles of that Church, and if a person can say—‘ I believe all which the Church believes and teaches,’ he is not required to explain what that is. This sufficiently signifies that he is docile and devoted to the authority of his Church ; and this, as I understand, is considered the great virtue in the Roman Catholic Religion.”

Ibid. p. 780.

“ To be a genuine Roman Catholic, he has, in truth, only one thing to believe, *i. e.* that it is his duty to relinquish the exercise of his private judgment altogether, and to repose his conscience in the keeping of his priest ; and this being granted, it appears of little consequence what may be the specific doctrines he assents to besides.”

#### NOTE Z.

Dr. HUSSEY, (late President of Maynooth,) Pastoral Address, 1797.

“ Manly candour is peculiarly the character of an Irish soldier, who ought not to be ashamed of openly professing the Catholic religion, the religion of Irishmen. Instruct them that in all matters regarding the service of the King, their officers are competent to command them, and that they are bound to obey ; but in matters regarding the service of the King of Kings, their officers have no authority over them . . . . The Catholic faith is suitable to all climes and all forms of government ; monarchies or republics, aristocracies or democracies, despotic or popular governments are not the concerns of the Catholic faith.”

Dr. DOYLE, (late Trustee of Maynooth,) Pastoral Address,  
November 19, 1822.

“ Dearly beloved brethren in Jesus Christ,” (such is the address to those whom Dr. Doyle proceeds thus to interrogate,) “. . . What is the period *you* have chosen to form a *dark and bloody conspiracy* against all that is established by the will of God in a country that should be more dear to you than life ? Precisely when our gracious Sovereign visited us like a common Father . . . . This was the period that you were impelled by the enemy of all good, to defeat the designs of Heaven



upon your country. Shall Ireland, my dear but infatuated brethren, be always doomed to suffer thus, and to suffer through the blindness and malice of her own children ? . . . We wish you peace and benediction . . . .”

## NOTE AA.

Dr. DOYLE, late Trustee of Maynooth, Titular Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin ; Letter to Mr. Robertson, M.P., p. 4.

“The Minister of England cannot look to the exertions of the Catholic Priesthood. This clergy, with few exceptions, are from the poorer ranks of the people : they inherit their feelings ; they are not, as formerly, brought up under despotic Governments. If a rebellion were raging from Carrickfergus to Cape Clear, no sentence of Excommunication would ever be fulminated by a Catholic Prelate, or, if fulminated, it would fall, as Grattan once said of British supremacy, like a spent thunderbolt.”

## NOTE BB.

Col. John IRWIN. (Commons, May 19, 1825.)

“Are you of opinion that the Roman Catholics who claim properties which have been forfeited, retain their desire to recover those properties as a fixed governing principle of conduct ?”

“No ; I will not say as a fixed governing principle of conduct. I will not go to that extent ; but that if there was such a convulsion as gave them any hopes of success, I do not hesitate to say, because I believe it, that they would come forward and claim. I hear a good deal, and do know several families who still hold for the claims to properties. . . . Very recently, a man told me of a family that I know, who live not far from me, who could advance a claim to some of your noble chairman’s property, Lord Palmerston.”

“How do you know that they look to the Protestant property ?”

“I will give a very strong instance of it. A gentleman, descended from a family that once possessed a great part of one barony in our county . . . as soon as the French landed, raised a corps of two thousand men, joined the French, took possession of a gentleman’s house and property adjoining, which he alleged had been the property of his ancestor, adhered to the French, was taken in arms at the battle of Ballinamuck, convicted and executed : that is a matter of public notoriety. It was in 1798.”

The witness mentioned other instances from his own personal knowledge.

## NOTE CC.

On the treatment of Heretics. (DE LA HOGUE, de Legibus, p. 179, and de Ecclesiâ, p. 404, Maynooth Class Book.

“Hæretici legibus ecclesiasticis tenentur; nec magis eximuntur, quam subditi in suum principem rebelles; retinet (Ecclesia) jurisdictionem in eos, quemadmodum dux militiæ jus habet *severiores* poenas decernendi adversus militem transfugam.”

And MENOCHIVS (the Scripture Commentary on Maynooth. See Note S. and above, p. 68,) on S. Matthew xiii. 29.

“Christ does not forbid *heretics* here to be *put to death*; on which point see Maldonatus on this place;” who thus observes: “There are some who abuse this place, by trying to prove that heretics *are not to be punished* or *put to death*. . . . They who *deny* that *heretics* are to be *put to death*, ought much rather to deny that murderers ought to be put to death; for heretics are so much the more pernicious than murderers, as it is a greater crime to slay the *souls* of men, than their bodies.”

## NOTE DD.

Dr. O'CONOR, Columbanus, iv. p. 84.

“It is true that the Irish Bishops have, by accepting the present Oath of Allegiance, renounced on paper the *indirect power* (of the Pope). But here is the spot where Columbanus has struck the hardest blows, showing that their practice is in diametrical opposition to their oath. Do they not hold that the *discipline of the Council of Trent* is as binding on Roman Catholics as the doctrine of the Seven Sacraments? and does not that discipline expressly grant to the Pope, and to Bishops as the *Pope's delegates*, powers which directly clash with that oath on this very article of indirect power? Will the *sworn delegates of Rome* condemn those bulls which maintain the indirect power as fundamentally erroneous? I venture to assert that they will not dare to do it. Will they condemn the bulls ‘*In Cænâ*’ or ‘*Unam Sanctam*?’ When Archbishop BUTLER, of Cashel, had too hastily renounced the deposing power, and his example was followed so hastily by others that it was too late to retract, he received from the *sacred Congregation of Propaganda* a letter of *rebuke*, because he had *presumed* to transact a business so momentous, without *previously advising* with the Court of Rome.”

## NOTE EE.

Mr. PHELAN, Digest, ii. 62.

“Of Maynooth the Public know something, and the Government might know more, perhaps so much, as that Dr. O'CONOR would not

(otherwise) have dared to assert, as he did on his death-bed, that an *esoteric doctrine* of the *high transalpine school* was taught in that seminary."

#### NOTE FF.

The Bull *Unigenitus* (A.D. 1713) *condemns* the following propositions as heretical:—

"The fear of an unjust excommunication ought not to deter us from our duty; rather, we ought peaceably to suffer an unjust excommunication and anathema, than to betray the truth." The above are the 91st and 92nd, among the *cl.* propositions of P. Quesnel, condemned "*tanquam falsæ, perniciosæ, Ecclesiæ et ejus praxi injuriosæ*," by Pope Clement XI. See *Jus Canonicum*, part iii. p. 144, in the bull *Unigenitus*."

The condemnation of Quesnel's articles, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, which maintained the necessity and benefits of the study of Holy Scripture, and speak of the sin of withholding the same from the people, deserves to be noticed, but is not here cited, as not having immediate connexion with our part—the *political* one—of this subject.

## POSTSCRIPT,

APRIL 4, 1845.

---

THE *amount* of the proposed *augmentation* of the grant to Maynooth, and the other details of the contemplated measure with respect to it, being now before the country, it remains only for us to leave the question in the hands of Parliament and the Public. We cannot do this without expressing our deep regret, that, as far as we have seen, no arguments have been offered (in behalf of the proposed increase) of such a kind as in any degree, in our opinion, to diminish the fears which such a proposal inspires.

Indeed, after a careful perusal of the report of the debate of April 3rd, I find only three reasons of any kind alleged in its favour: first, the justice and expediency of the measure; secondly, the hope of conciliating the Irish Romanist priesthood; and thirdly, the example of King George III. and Mr. Pitt.

I have already anticipated these arguments, and



have endeavoured to examine their value. With respect to the first of these arguments, it rests on a position, the fallacy of which seems to have escaped the notice of many persons, and therefore appears to require a few more words of observation.

It is said,—“England has given public aid to persons of various religious persuasions; why not then to the Roman Catholic Clergy?”

Granting, for argument's sake, that one act of this kind justifies a second, and that a second warrants a third, and so on *ad infinitum*, yet I deny, as I have already done (pp. 5, 6), the analogy on which this argument is founded; and in conformity with this denial, I have treated this subject, *not on religious grounds, but purely on civil ones.*

*If* the Dissenters here referred to had bound themselves by *solemn oaths of allegiance* to a *foreign power*; *if* they were *subjects* of the Crown of France, or of Prussia, or of Austria, and not of *England*; then the two cases *would* be similar, but *only then*. Let the Trustees and Professors of Maynooth enter into the condition of subjects of Queen Victoria; let them renounce what we affirm to be *unlawful* and *unconstitutional* oaths—viz. those of vassalage to a foreign potentate which they have taken—a vassalage incompatible with the duty which they owe to the Sovereign whom Almighty God has set over them; let them become, in the full sense of the word, *fellow-citizens* of the Protestants of England, Ireland, and Scotland; and then let the State

regard and treat them accordingly. *Until* this is the case, the augmentation of the grant to the College of Maynooth is nothing less than a sacrifice of our own strength to aggrandize a *foreign* and *hostile* power *against ourselves*. It is to be hoped that we may hear no more of this pretended analogy, which is unjust, unloyal, and untrue.

All intention of *interference* with the present *constitution* of Maynooth is distinctly *disclaimed* by the framers of the new measure.

Such being the condition of things, the case assumes a still more serious aspect.

In the absence of such reasoning as I have described, I have felt a stronger desire to search for arguments *against* my own conclusions. Nothing, I think, can affect the very momentous deductions which we have derived from the *relation* of the *Trustees* and *Professors* of *Maynooth* to the see of *Rome*, and the consequent *anti-monarchical* character of its agency and results. But it has occurred to me to consider, that it may perhaps be alleged by some, that the facts above stated, concerning the nature of the *Jesuitical* influence prevalent at Maynooth, are not of very recent date. It may be said that Dr. Murray, who evinced so much eagerness to introduce Mr. Kenney as his Colleague and Deputy in the Institution,—so that, as Mr. Kenney himself tells us, his election to the Vice-presidency was “the effect of the *earnest request* of the then coadjutor Archbishop of Dublin (Dr. Murray), who

was at that time the President of the College<sup>1</sup>—has *ceased* to be President since the year 1813; and that Mr. Kenney himself quitted the College in the same year; and that it is therefore *probable at least* that Maynooth may now be exempt from Jesuitical influence. To this we reply, that we would gladly indulge this hope: we would willingly believe that such is the case. But let us have *evidence* of the fact being so. This is what we desire. As we said before, we derive our knowledge of Maynooth from Maynooth itself. And from it we gather no such comfortable assurance as that just mentioned, but *the reverse*.

As we have said, we willingly consent to know nothing of Maynooth, but from Maynooth itself. And what is the most recent evidence from that quarter even concerning Dr. Murray and Mr. Kenney? and what inferences are we thence compelled to derive?

We find from the records of the College, that Dr. Murray resigned his office of *President* in 1813; but that he ceased to be President only in order to become *both* a *Trustee* and a *Visitor* of the College; being also titular Archbishop of Dublin (at a distance of only twelve miles from Maynooth); and that he holds this joint office of *Trustee* and *Visitor* at this day: and we now further find, that the *very person who introduced the Head of the Jesuits as*

<sup>1</sup> Maynooth Report, p. 381.

*Vice-President into Maynooth is to be confirmed in both those offices by the new measure.* And from Dr. Murray's own declaration—to quote his words—“that he was so happy as to be able to *procure the advantage of Mr. Kenney's assistance*” while he was President, and from his public avowal to the Commissioners of Irish Education Enquiry in 1826<sup>1</sup>, that he “should be very happy that *all* should have a respect for the *Jesuit body*; and that *he himself had a great respect for the Jesuit body*,” and from his confession that “he was intimately acquainted with the Institution of the Sodality of the *Sacred Heart*,” whose connexion with the Jesuits admits of no reasonable doubt (see above, p. 65—68), and that its institution was in fact “*recommended by*” himself<sup>2</sup>—we may conjecture in what spirit he has exercised, still exercises, and will continue to exercise, his influence in his united offices of *Trustee* and *Visitor*, especially if, *instead of reprobation*, he should now only receive fresh honour, encouragement, and power, from Parliament and from the Country, when made fully aware of the principles in which he acted as *President*.

And further, though Mr. Kenney too quitted Maynooth in 1813, as we have seen, yet he left it only to become Founder and President of the *Jesuit College of Clongowes*, at a distance only of *six miles* from Maynooth; and he was specially invited, as

<sup>1</sup> Maynooth Report, p. 410.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 409.



we have also seen, by the authorities of Maynooth, from time to time, to resume his office there of teaching and superintendence; to quote his own words, "he was very often asked to conduct the spiritual Retreats" of the Students at the College<sup>1</sup>. He was still, not in *name*, but in *fact*, Vice-President of Maynooth while he was President of Clongowes.

I will not travel beyond the records of Maynooth to trace him further; but I cannot fail to observe that in the most recent public official document which we possess concerning it, Dr. Crotty himself, the then *President* of Maynooth (in 1826), notwithstanding all the reserve which his situation would necessarily inspire,—especially in the presence of a Commission of Enquiry,—stated<sup>2</sup> that he "considered the school of Clongowes" (conducted by Mr. Kenney and nine other *Jesuits*) "to be the *best in Ireland* to which Roman Catholics can have recourse."

But even *if* Dr. Murray and Mr. Kenney had *now* no connexion whatever with Maynooth; even if *circumstances*, in this respect, *were* changed; yet the *Constitution* of Maynooth is *not changed*. Eleven of the fifteen Trustees are still nominees of the *Pope*, bound to him by the most solemn oaths. They are still a self-elected body; and elect the Professors,

<sup>1</sup> Maynooth Report, p. 382. See above, pp. 62—70.

<sup>2</sup> Maynooth Report, p. 92.

who are also bound by an oath of obedience to the Pope. The same causes will continue to produce the same effects. Mr. Kenney himself, in reply to the question of the Commissioners, whether “the Education given in the College of Palermo (at which Mr. Kenney was educated, and which, in his own words<sup>1</sup>, “is *exclusively* under the management of *Jesuits*,”) is the *same*, or materially different from that of *Maynooth* ?” answered, that “*All the principles of faith and morals are precisely the same*”<sup>2</sup>. As long as the organization of the College remains unaltered, whether this *individual* or that happens to be connected with it, is comparatively of little moment. *One* Murray and *one* Kenney may disappear; but *others* will soon rise up in their room. And it is now proposed not only *not* to *change* the system, but to give it greater permanence and greater power.

And as a further demonstration of this, let us observe, that, on the same occasion above specified, Dr. Crotty said<sup>3</sup>, that though he *believed* that, “considering the *present* state of *public opinion*,—I mean (he adds) that of the *Protestant* portion of the empire,—the Board of Trustees would not *wish* to appoint a person *professedly* a *Jesuit* to any situation in the College, yet I beg leave (he said) to state, that I

<sup>1</sup> Maynooth Report, p. 396.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 382.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. p. 92.

think they would not reject him on *any other ground.*"

If, now, this *only* bar to the election of a Jesuit should be removed; if this sole *ground* of objection should be taken away; if the "*public opinion*," which was the *only* obstacle to the election of *Jesuits* "*professedly* such," (and there are many who *are* Jesuits without being such *professedly*,) which existed in 1826, and which was even then, as we have seen, *no obstacle at all* to the election of the *leading Jesuit of Ireland* to the much more responsible office of *Vice-President* of Maynooth,—if, I say, this impediment should now be removed, and if the "*public opinion*" (after all the evidence of the case has been placed before it) should be so changed, as to vote new honours and endowments to Maynooth; if it should *treble* the resources of the Trustees, and give them fresh dignity and permanence as a Body Corporate, and should thus signify its *approval* of their past conduct, and its *confidence* in them for the future, then the Constitution of Maynooth, thus strengthened and amplified, will bring forth its past and present fruits in tenfold abundance; then, instead of what we have *already* witnessed of both *Papal* and *Jesuitical* influence, we shall have the same multiplied in infinite amount and intensity; and we may form a reasonable conjecture of the tremendous consequences which will result, and that in a very short period of time, from the aggrandizement of that system, which

has already done so much to weaken the stability of the Monarchy of the United Kingdom. Every fresh stone added to the fabric of Maynooth will be taken from the foundations of the British Throne.

THE END.



















